



# REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

OF THE

## Central Board of Irrigation

ON

## Distribution of the Waters

OF THE

# Indus and its Tributaries.

1st. to 8th. March 1935,  
17th. to 20th. June 1935.



## VOLUME II.

History, Appointment of Committee,  
Briefs, Interim Report, Appendices.

(For official use only.)

I. I. B.

626.812+627.15] 00.1.

SIMLA.

16th. September, 1935.



## Volume II.

## CONTENTS.

## Part III.

					PARA.	PAGE.
History of Dispute : Appointment of Committee—						
History to June 1927	..	..	..	..	1	2
Indus Discharge Committee	..	..	..	..	4	11
Committee on the Bhakra Dam Project	..	..	..	..	8	13
Claims of parties interested in the waters of the Indus in 1931	..	..	..	..	12	14
Subsequent developments	..	..	..	..	17	16
Additional supplies of water allowed temporarily to Khairpur	..	..	..	..	20	17
Sutlej Valley Project Enquiry Committee, Bahawalpur, 1932	..	..	..	..	21	..
Additional supplies of water allowed temporarily to Bahawalpur	..	..	..	..	22	..
Claim by Sind to increased maximum withdrawals at Sukkur	..	..	..	..	24	18
Attitude of Bikaner State	..	..	..	..	26	..
Genesis of the Committee on the distribution of the waters of the Indus and its tributaries	..	..	..	..	27	..
Procedure	..	..	..	..	32	20
Second meeting	..	..	..	..	35	..

## Part IV.

## Briefs of Interested Parties—

## Bombay (Sind), with annexures—

Revised requirements at Sukkur	..	..	..	..	3	27
Supplies available at Sukkur	..	..	..	..	4	..
Rabi supply for Khairpur State	..	..	..	..	5	..
Discharges for British Sind	..	..	..	..	7	..
Other interested parties	..	..	..	..	8	28
Leakage at Sukkur	..	..	..	..	9	..
Sind inundation canals	..	..	..	..	10	..

## Panjab, with annexures—

Haveli Project	..	..	..	..	1	34
Thal Project	..	..	..	..	12	36
Bhakra Dam Scheme	..	..	..	..	15	..
Woolar Lake Scheme	..	..	..	..	16	..
Other storage schemes	..	..	..	..	20	37
Feeder canals	..	..	..	..	21	..

## North-West Frontier Province

..	..	..	..	..	..	Nil.
----	----	----	----	----	----	------

## Bahawalpur State, with annexures—

Agreement of 1920	..	..	..	..	1	41
Subsequent arrangement	..	..	..	..	5	..
Findings of 1929 Committee	..	..	..	..	10	42
Extra demands in Rabi	..	..	..	..	11	..
Re-distribution within the State	..	..	..	..	14	..
Supplies available in recent years	..	..	..	..	22	43
Insufficient supplies for S. V. P.	..	..	..	..	25	44
Unfairness of 1920 agreement	..	..	..	..	27	45
Sind requirements	..	..	..	..	29	..
Sind and Rabi supplies	..	..	..	..	32	..
Sind and Kharif supplies	..	..	..	..	40	46

## CONTENTS—contd.

				PARA.	PAGE.
Bahawalpur State, with annexures— <i>contd.</i>					
Sind inundation canals	..	..	..	42	46
Expansion of cotton cultivation	..	..	..	44	..
Haveli Project requirements	..	..	..	45	47
State canal requirements	..	..	..	57	48
Proposals	..	..	..	59	49
The Thal Project	..	..	..	61	..
Sind to take Indus supplies only	..	..	..	63	50
Bikaner State, with annexures—					
Sanctity of agreements	..	..	..	1	59
Rights of usage of water	..	..	..	3	..
Distribution of Sutlej Supplies	..	..	..	6	60
Limits of Irrigation	..	..	..	10	61
Economic interdependence of partners and canals	..	..	..	13	..
1920 Agreement provisions	..	..	..	15	..
Divergences from the Agreement	..	..	..	16	62
Revised requirements	..	..	..	21	63
Priority to perennial canals	..	..	..	30	65
Proposals	..	..	..	32	66
Supplies available for canals	..	..	..	34	..
Effects of rainfall on duties	..	..	..	38	68
Absorption allowances	..	..	..	40	..
Probable irrigation with supplies available	..	..	..	41	..
Financial implication of the proposals	..	..	..	48	71
Summary of Conclusions	..	..	..	51	72
Khairpur State—					
Provisions for State in Sukkur Barrage Projects	..	..	..	3	81
No Rabi supply in 1919 Project	..	..	..	5	..
Disadvantages to State of the Sukkur Barrage Project	..	..	..	8	..
Project provision inadequate	..	..	..	10	82
Full Supply Factor unjustifiable	..	..	..	15	..
State's present requirements	..	..	..	19	..
Supplies available	..	..	..	27	83
Proposals	..	..	..	29	..
<b>Part V.</b>					
Letter No. 2090-F. 47, dated 20th April 1935, from the INDEPENDENT MEMBERS, Committee on Distribution of Waters of Indus, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Industries and Labour, forwarding the Interim Report.					86
Interim Report.					
Terms of Reference	..	..	..	1	87
Composition of the Committee	..	..	..	2	..
The ISSUES	..	..	..	3	..
The POINTS FOR DISCUSSION	..	..	..	5	88
Irrigation of Khairpur State to be brought on a perennial basis	..	..	..	7	89
Water available for the Thal project and the Sukkur Barrage	..	..	..	12	90
Clause 4. D. 2. of the Tripartite Agreement of 1920	..	..	..	18	..
Capacities of Haveli and Panjnad canals	..	..	..	19	91

## CONTENTS—concl.

	PARA.	PAGE.
<b>Interim Report—<i>contd.</i></b>		
Distribution of supplies between Haveli and Panjnad .. ..	22	91
Distribution of supplies on the Gharra reach of the Sutlej .. ..	23	..
Dates of opening of non-perennial channels .. ..	25	92
Summary of Findings .. .. .. ..	28	93

**Part VI.****Appendices.**

I.—A. Note dated 10th December 1920, by Sir Thomas Ward, Kt., C.I.E., M.V.O., Inspector General of Irrigation in India, on the urgency of the accurate gauging of the Indus River and its tributaries .. .. .. .. .. .. .. ..	96
B. List of sites referred to in Sir Thomas Ward's Note of 10th December 1920 .. .. .. .. .. .. .. ..	98
II.—A. The original ISSUES .. .. .. .. .. .. .. ..	99
B. The final form of the ISSUES .. .. .. .. .. .. .. ..	100
III.—Circular dated 5th March 1935 from INDEPENDENT MEMBERS to INTERESTED PARTIES, presenting POINTS FOR DISCUSSION .. .. .. ..	101
IV.—Statement showing discharges of Panjnad River during early and late kharif period during the past four years (to be substituted for Annexure G of the Bahawalpur BRIEF) .. .. .. ..	102
V.—DEFINITIONS in respect to areas employed by the INTERESTED PARTIES in their BRIEFS indicating the basis of allocation of water .. .. .. ..	103
Subject Index to Vols. I, II & III .. .. .. ..	105



**PART III.**

**HISTORY OF THE DISPUTE.**

**APPOINTMENT OF THE COMMITTEE.**

## HISTORY OF THE DISPUTE.

### APPOINTMENT OF THE COMMITTEE.

PREFATORY NOTE.—Cross references to paragraphs in this Part III "History of the Dispute. Appointment of the Committee" are made thus:—paragraph 6.

#### History of the Dispute to June 1927.

The history of the dispute between the Government of Bombay, and the Government of the Punjab, in respect to the apportioning of the waters of the Indus, up to the date 2nd. June 1927 is contained in Despatch No. 3-Public Works from the Government of India to Secretary of State for India, dated Simla, 2nd. June 1927.

2. The following paragraphs are quoted from that Despatch.

\* \* \* \* \*

(3) The controversy between the two Governments may be said to have commenced with the publication of the Report of the Indian Cotton Committee in 1919. This Committee was particularly interested in the project for the Sukkur Barrage and Canals, then under preparation, and in a foot-note to page 27 of their Report, two of its members made a specific recommendation that no irrigation projects which would affect the Indus supply should be undertaken in the Punjab until the Sukkur Barrage and the Canals therefrom had been carried out or, in the alternative, until the scheme had been definitely abandoned. It was, doubtless, this recommendation which led the Government of Bombay, in August 1919, to represent that certain projects, then under consideration in the Punjab, must, if constructed, necessarily affect the volume of water reaching Sukkur, and to ask that full details of these projects should be furnished to them.

(4) This request was duly forwarded by the Government of India to the Punjab Government for compliance. It elicited a request from the latter for similar information regarding projects in Bombay, which the Government of the Presidency were asked to furnish.

(5) Before the information referred to above had been received, the Government of the Punjab, in September 1919, submitted to the Government of India a comprehensive scheme for the annual irrigation, from a weir on the Indus at Kalabagh, of 1,800,000 acres in the Sind Sagar Doab, commonly known as the Thal. It is unnecessary to discuss the details of this particular proposal, which was estimated to cost Rs. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$  crores, as it has since been abandoned, but it is of interest to notice that the local Government, in forwarding it for examination by the technical advisers of the Government of India, laid considerable stress upon the difficulties which were likely to be encountered in its operation. "It should" they stated "be distinctly understood that the colonization on the canal will bear little or no resemblance to the existing Canal Colonies of the Punjab. The irrigable areas will be of very irregular shapes and much dispersed: communications will be inadequate: the soil will, much of it, be difficult of cultivation, and irrigation may for a time be subject to interruptions from the difficulties of maintaining the water-courses. The crown land will probably be found unsuitable for anything on a large scale in the shape of reward grants to soldiers, or of grants to colonists from distant areas, and it will have to be colonized on a system of its own, which will possibly include a large proportion of capitalist areas and the adoption of an inferior class of peasant colonists, recruited mainly from the Thal itself and other areas in the Western Punjab. The existence of the sand-dunes, both in proprietary and in Government lands, will be a serious obstacle, and the Lieutenant-Governor does not anticipate any very substantial disappearance of the sandy areas such as has taken place on other canals. The experience of cultivation on the Inundation Canals in the Muzaffargarh Thal gives grounds, however, for expecting that the cultivation may increase to some extent beyond the amount assumed in the project by the gradual levelling and irrigating of land now occupied by sand hills".

(6) It may, perhaps, be asked why the Government of the Punjab were desirous of proceeding with a scheme in which so many uncertain factors were involved. The answer to this question will be found in the Sind Sagar Doab Colonization Act which was passed by the Punjab Legislative Council in 1902. This Act, passed, according to its preamble "to establish the title of the Government in land to be acquired in connection with the making of a canal in the Sind Sagar Doab" provided for the taking of agreements from persons holding proprietary rights in the lands of the doab, whereby they surrendered those rights to Government with effect from the date upon which the excavation of the canal should be begun, Government agreeing to grant in return, on the completion of the canal, similar rights in an area equal to one-fourth of that of the land surrendered. Agreements of this nature were taken in respect of 2,280,000 acres of proprietary waste. The cutting of the first sod of the canal would thus have put the local Government into possession, free of charge, of 1,710,000 acres of land capable of sale to capitalists and others.

(7) Lord Chelmsford's Government were not however, prepared to accept the project at the juncture at which it was submitted. They were anticipating the early receipt of two further large projects drawing their supplies from the Indus and its tributaries, the Sutlej Valley Project in the Punjab and the Sukkur Barrage Project in Sind, and were strongly of opinion that these two schemes should first be taken up. They deemed it most undesirable that the Thal Canal should be commenced simultaneously with the Sutlej Valley Scheme, as colonists were obviously unlikely to come forward to take up the inferior land on the former so long as good land was available for colonization on the latter. In April 1920, therefore, they returned the project to the Government of the Punjab, adding that they would be prepared to examine it in detail and, if such examination proved satisfactory, to recommend it for sanction, should it be found impossible to obtain sanction to the Sutlej Valley Scheme.

(8) On the 29th. July 1920, the Punjab Government submitted certain statements showing the requirements of the major irrigation schemes "contemplated in the near future" in that province, the Thal, Haveli, and Sutlej Valley Projects being included in this category. The local Government have, in the subsequent correspondence, placed considerable importance upon the date of this letter. Copies of these statements were forwarded to the Government of Bombay in the following month. •

(9) It was at about this time that the Government of India received, from the Governments of Bombay and the Punjab, respectively, the two great projects for the Sukkur Barrage and Canals and for the Sutlej Valley Canals. The former was despatched to them on the 30th. July 1920, the latter on the 8th. September 1920. Both schemes were subjected to very careful examination by the Government of India's technical advisers, two of the questions which received special attention being the quantity of water allotted to the areas to be irrigated, and the availability of this volume at the heads of the canals. It was only after they were fully satisfied on both these points that Lord Chelmsford's Government recommended the two projects to the Secretary of State for sanction, the Sukkur Barrage Project in their despatch No. 23-Public Works dated the 16th. December 1920, and the Sutlej Valley Project in their despatch No. 15-Public Works, dated the 17th. March 1921. The final sanctions of the Secretary of State to the projects were received in his telegrams No. 1324, dated the 7th. April 1923 and No. 6260, dated the 9th. December 1921, respectively.

(10) The duties (i.e., the areas of the various crops which can be irrigated by a given volume of water) adopted in the case of the Sukkur Barrage Project are based on the considerations explained in Chapter II of Messrs. Baker and Lane's report, which forms Volume XX of the project estimate. It is true that these duties are lower than those obtained in the Punjab, but they are higher than those which have previously been realised in Sind, even on canals which enjoy a perennial supply, and the differentiation is fully justified by the difference in climatic conditions. Lord Chelmsford's Government, in paragraph 13 of their despatch of the 16th. December 1920, with which the project was forwarded to the Secretary of State for sanction, stated that they were satisfied that the duties adopted were such as might safely be accepted; they went further and added that they were such as would allow of a further extension of the cultivated area, if this were later found to be necessary.

(11) The question of the supplies available was discussed at considerable length in paragraph 15 of the same despatch. It was there admitted that the data available were insufficient to enable an accurate determination to be made of the effect on the discharge of the Indus at Sukkur of the withdrawals proposed for the Sutlej Valley Project in the Punjab, but it was possible to show that, even assuming the worst conditions, the shortage at Sukkur was not likely to be greater than could be surmounted by care and economy in distribution. The final conclusion arrived at is summarised in the last sub-paragraph of the paragraph referred to which runs as follows:—"We consider, therefore, that both the Sukkur and the Sutlej Valley schemes can safely be constructed at the same time, and that there will, when the Sutlej Valley scheme is in full operation, be sufficient water in the Indus at Sukkur to provide fully for the Sukkur scheme. We are instituting a comprehensive system of discharge stations, which, in due time, will admit of a more detailed study of the effect of the withdrawals in the Punjab on the Indus at Sukkur, but it will be some years before useful deductions can be drawn from the observations recorded, and we trust that you will not consider it necessary to defer the construction of this great project or of the Sutlej Valley scheme in the meantime."

(12) The institution of a comprehensive system of discharge stations was undertaken on the advice of Sir Thomas Ward, the then Inspector General of Irrigation. In a note dated the 10th. December 1920, he urged the importance of a full investigation into the supplies of the Indus and its tributaries, and certain of the comments made by him in this note are worth quotation. "Prima facie," he stated, "it is logical to assume that the abstraction of water from the tributaries of the Indus must necessarily diminish the volume passing Sukkur, but it is quite possible that this diminution is to some extent compensated for by seepage back into the river, during the *rabi* season, of a portion of the enormous withdrawals made by the Punjab during the *khurif*. Unfortunately the data available are too meagre to permit of a definite conclusion being arrived at on the subject. Such records of discharges as exist have,

however, been carefully examined and analysed, and, on the information before them, the Government of India are satisfied that the Sutlej Valley Project can be put in hand without prejudicing the supplies necessary to secure the area of irrigation contemplated on the Sukkur Canals. More than this it is impossible to assert, and the question of the collection of reliable data for the disposal of the problem has become one of the first urgency. It will obviously be necessary, once construction commences on the Sukkur scheme, for any future projects put forward by the Punjab to be very carefully examined in relation to the possible effects of further withdrawals from the tributaries of the Indus upon the rights to irrigation from the Sukkur Canals upon which the Government of Bombay are now entering. I have no hesitation in saying that the data for such an examination do not at present exist, and that, unless steps are immediately taken to collect and collate them, endless difficulty is likely to ensue. Almost all the controversies which have up to date taken place in India in respect of questions of water rights have been directly attributable to the fact that adequate figures were not forthcoming and that consequently recourse had to be had to indirect deductions and presumptions; the only method of averting such controversies is to have at hand reliable information on the factors in the case."

(13) The Government of Lord Chelmsford forwarded this note to the two local Governments concerned, recommending that an experienced officer should immediately be placed on special duty by each of them to conduct the gauging operations in his own province, daily discharges being recorded at twenty-eight selected sites. The two officers should, they suggested, work in close collaboration and submit joint reports at intervals on the results obtained, for examination by a Committee consisting of the Inspector-General of Irrigation, the Chief Engineer, Bombay, the Chief Engineer in Sind and two Chief Engineers from the Punjab.

(14) The proposal was accepted by both the local Governments, but the Punjab Government also questioned the propriety of the assignment to the Government of Bombay of any right to the water allotted to the Sukkur Barrage Project. "The Punjab Government", they wrote on January 25th, 1921, "observes that certain rights in the water supplies of the Indus and its tributaries have been assigned by the Government of India to Bombay, without any regard to the Statement of the Punjab future requirements and supplies available, which were communicated to you in my letter No. 0762-W. I., dated the 29th. July 1920, and which was furnished long before the above rights were assigned to the Bombay Government, and would, therefore, reserve the right to question or object to these rights being so assigned when the cases of the Bhakra Dam, Thal and Haveli Projects, the supplies required for which were given therein, are being dealt with."

(15) In October 1921, the Government of Bombay forwarded to the Government of the Punjab a statement showing the requirements of Sind on the completion of the Sukkur Barrage Project; the receipt of this statement drew from the Punjab Government a further reference to the reservation mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

(16) Meanwhile, in July 1921, the Punjab Government had again advanced the Thal Canal Project, but in a considerably altered form. They proposed a programme of construction which contemplated the commencement of the Thal Canal in the fourth year and that of the Haveli Canal in the sixth year after work on the Sutlej Valley Project had been put in hand, and asked for the Government of India's acceptance of this arrangement. They laid particular stress upon the fact that the local Legislative Council was pressing either for the commencement of the work or for the repeal of the Sind Sagar Doab Colonization Act, and expressed the fear that, if the project were much longer deferred and the Act repealed, they would lose the enormous advantage of the reversion to them of one and three quarters millions of acres of land. Lord Reading's Government were not, however, prepared to commit themselves on the subject, and, in December 1921, they informed the local Government that the most to which they could agree was that a strong *prima facie* case had been made out for continuing and completing the surveys and investigations necessary for the preparation of a detailed project estimate for the Thal Canal, adding that, in any such project, particular attention should be given to the question of the supplies necessary for the Sukkur Barrage Project in Sind.

(17) Following on this letter there came a lull of some fifteen months, until with the announcement that the Sukkur Barrage Scheme had been finally sanctioned by the Secretary of State, the controversy again broke out. In April 1923, within a month of this announcement, the Punjab Government entered a further protest against what they regarded as the preference shown to the requirements of Sind, pointing out that they had made a public announcement to the effect that they were expediting the survey work on the Thal Project with a view to having the revised project estimate ready for submission to the Government of India by October 1924 and to having work actually begun on the Thal Canal in October 1925. With this letter, they forwarded a technical note by one of their Chief Engineers in which, for the first time, the question of the duties adopted in the Sukkur Project was raised, and the argument advanced that duties comparable with those ruling in the Punjab should be applied for the purpose of calculating the supplies to which the Barrage Scheme was entitled.

(18) This letter was followed almost immediately by a strong representation from the Government of Bombay against the attitude adopted by the Government of the Punjab. They pointed out that the Punjab had had more than its share of the waters of the Indus and the five rivers and that it had carried out vast schemes of perennial irrigation while Sind had so far not commenced a single one. They laid stress upon the statement made in Sir Thomas Ward's note that all future Punjab schemes would have to be carefully examined in relation to the possible effects of further withdrawals from the Indus and its tributaries upon the rights of the Sukkur Projects to water, and invited attention to the fact that this principle had been repudiated by the Punjab Government. They traversed the argument of the latter that the statement of their requirements overrode the needs of Sind because it was made a few months before the Inspector General's note was written ; the rights of Sind had been duly recognised and stated in that note, but they had been neither created nor assigned thereby. They complained that, when the Sutlej Valley Project was under consideration, they were not consulted as regards its effects upon Sind, and that they were consequently, faced with the situation that, on the completion of that scheme, the supplies available for the Barrage Canals would be considerably less than those on which their results had been calculated. Any further lowering of the river would, they held, have most disastrous consequences. By far the greatest danger to the welfare of Sind was the Thal Project. The withdrawal from the Indus of water sufficient for so large an area as the Sind Sagar Doab must, they averred, obviously involve the loss of an equal quantity to the Barrage Canals, which would be the ruin of the Barrage Project and of the Province which depended upon it. "This Government" they wrote "is advised that the Sind Sagar Doab is at present a sandy, desolate tract with a very meagre population ; that its few inhabitants are unacquainted with canal irrigation and perfectly capable of supporting themselves without it : in fine, that the whole Thal Project is a financial speculation for the exploitation of a wilderness which will have to be colonized and developed by imported labour. If such be the case, the argument of this Government is doubly strong. They protest against the wrecking of the Barrage Project by the latter Thal Project, and against the sacrifice of the welfare of a populous Province in order to exploit a desert for the benefit of the speculator."

(19) The representations of the two Governments were very carefully considered by the Government of India. Any final settlement as regards the partition of the water was, of course, impossible ; it was realised that this must inevitably wait until reliable information as to supplies based on results obtained over a series of years was available from the recently inaugurated gauging operations. But on the main points immediately at issue there was no difficulty in arriving at conclusions. It was felt to be impossible to accept the Punjab Government's argument that they had established a right to water merely because they had put forward a statement showing the supplies required for certain projects, some of which had not even been finally prepared. As regards the duties adopted in the Sukkur Barrage Scheme, the whole question was re-examined, but nothing was found to justify reconsideration of the figures adopted in the project estimate. No direct analogy is possible between the results obtained in the Punjab, where the canals are very materially helped by rainfall, and those to be expected in Sind, where the rainfall is so small that the crops must depend entirely on canal water. The areas under the Punjab canals get from three to five times more rain than the Barrage Project tract ; during the *rabi* season the rainfall in the latter is negligible, and cannot be counted upon to supplement the canals even to the extent of a single watering. Due weight had not been given in the Punjab Government's arguments to the importance of rainfall and of its effect on the working of the canals. As already stated, the duties adopted in the Barrage Project are higher than any yet obtained in Sind, save in exceptional cases, and many Sind officials have expressed the opinion that they are pitched too high rather than too low. The Government of India have never shared this apprehension, but they have always realised that the project duties will not be worked up to until the canals have been in operation for some years. They were, therefore, in no way prepared to countenance an arbitrary enhancement of these duties and a consequent reduction of the supplies allotted to the project.

(20) The time had clearly come for a definite statement to be made, and this was promulgated in a letter addressed by the Government of India to the Government of the Punjab on the 21st. August 1923, a copy of the letter being endorsed also to the Government of Bombay. Lord Reading's Government pointed out that the Sukkur Barrage and Canals Project had been designed for the benefit of a country that was fully entitled to the water which it was proposed to allot to it, and that its supplies must obviously be assured by any project which might subsequently be put forward, whether in the Punjab or Sind, before such project was accepted. They had satisfied themselves that there was sufficient water to provide for the need of the two large projects recently sanctioned ; as regards prospective projects, they believed that the result of the gaugings in progress would show that the supplies of the rivers would be sufficient for the full ultimate requirements of both provinces and deprecated the prior raising by the Government of the Punjab of the question of the respective rights of the two Governments. With reference to the particular case of the Sukkur Project, they stated that the duties adopted for the purpose of ascertaining the volume required for the canals had been accepted, after careful consideration, as reasonable in view of the peculiar conditions and scanty rainfall obtaining in Sind, and that they were not prepared to reopen the subject. They concluded by giving an

assurance to both local Governments that no new major project in either the Punjab or Sind, the construction of which might affect prospective projects in the other province, would be sanctioned until the Government of the latter had received timely notice and full information regarding it, and had been given an opportunity to represent their case should such project appear to them to be unfavourable to their interests.

(21) Nothing further was heard in the matter from either Government until, some fifteen months later, in November 1924, the Government of the Punjab again addressed the Government of India regarding the proposed Thal Canal. They stated that a revised scheme had been prepared, for the annual irrigation of 2,170,000 acres in the Thal at a cost of about Rs. 13 crores, but that it contained some uncertain factors in regard to which they desired to satisfy themselves before submitting the project for sanction. *Inter alia*, it was uncertain whether a large part of the area would produce crops without manuring and whether the Indus silt would have a fertilising value or prove deleterious, making it difficult to determine what water-rates could reasonably be demanded. They therefore proposed to construct a small experimental canal taking out of the Indus near Kalabagh, to cost about Rs. 50 lakhs and to irrigate about 130,000 acres, the operation of which would, they considered, yield the information necessary for the working out of the larger scheme. The experimental scheme was expected to prove productive in itself.

(22) In accordance with their undertaking, the Government of India referred the proposal to the Government of Bombay, who objected strenuously to it, partly on the ground that it would abstract an additional 750 cubic feet of water a second from the Indus, to the detriment of the Barrage Project, and partly because it was, admittedly, only a fore-runner of a large scheme for which in the local Government's view water would never be available. They took the opportunity again to express the earnest hope that no proposals whatever for further withdrawals from the Indus or its tributaries would be entertained by the Government of India until the Sukkur scheme had worked sufficiently long to enable proof to be obtained that there was actually surplus water available after meeting the requirements both of the scheme itself and of lower Sind also.

(23) The Government of Lord Reading were, however, unwilling arbitrarily to overrule the Punjab Government in the matter. The figures submitted by the Government of Bombay in support of their contention gave, they considered, an *ultra-pessimistic* view of the discharges likely to be available at Sukkur; it seemed, moreover, improbable that the abstraction of so small a volume as 750 cubic feet a second at Kalabagh could really affect materially the supplies to the Barrage Canals. Until such time as reliable information was available as a result of the gauging operations, they were not prepared to make any definite pronouncement to the effect that the Thal Canal could never be built, and, as the project could not, consequently, be finally ruled out, it seemed to them very difficult to justify an objection to the experimental canal. Provided that acceptance of the experimental canal was not held to connote acceptance of anything further, there were many points in its favour. It would give a breathing space of several years at the end of which time, if the Punjab Government still desired to proceed with the major scheme, sufficient data would be available to enable a definite quantitative determination of its effect to be arrived at, while, having regard to the view of certain experienced revenue officers who had reported on the scheme from time to time, there seemed to be at least a possibility that the experiment might show that the soil of the Thal was unsuitable for artificial irrigation, and that the main controversy might, therefore, never arise at all. In these circumstances, informal negotiations were opened with the Government of Bombay in the hope that it might be possible to persuade them to resile from the attitude which they had taken up.

(24) These negotiations were nearing completion and success appeared to be in sight when, in September 1925, the Government of India were surprised to receive from the Punjab Government a communication which stated that that Government had, some months previously, decided to drop altogether the proposal for the experimental canal and to proceed with the preparation of a much larger scheme for the irrigation of the Thal. This was the first intimation received either by the Government of India or of Bombay of this change of attitude.

(25) The revised project, known as the Thal Canal Lesser Project, was received from the Punjab Government in the following month. It contemplated the irrigation of 880,000 acres per annum, the expenditure of Rs. 7 crores, and the withdrawal of 3,085 cubic feet a second from the Indus during the cold weather season. But it was not explained how the local Government had solved the uncertainties, to elucidate which the experimental canal had been proposed; it was merely stated that further investigation had shown that the experimental canal would not be a productive work and that, consequently, it had been decided to embark boldly upon the lesser main project. The project was accompanied by a technical note by the Punjab Chief Engineer elaborating the theory that withdrawals made in that province are compensated for by seepage back into the river lower down, and repeating the contention that an excessive amount of water had been allotted to the Barrage Scheme in its project estimate.

(26) In accordance with the usual procedure the project, before being taken into consideration by the Government of India, was forwarded to the Bombay Government for their opinion. In reply, the local Government, while intimating that they might have been prepared to reconsider their decision regarding the small experimental canal, recorded an emphatic refusal to agree to the construction of the larger project until the Sutlej Valley Scheme was actually working and its effect upon the supplies at Sukkur was known, and until the necessary data were available for the final determination of the question of inflow into and outflow from the Indus and its tributaries.

(27) Lord Reading's Government found themselves forced, in equity, to support the attitude adopted by the Government of Bombay and, on the 18th. February 1926, they promulgated their final conclusions as follows :—

- (a) That, until such time as the Sukkur Barrage Scheme comes into operation, and further experience of perennial irrigation in Sind is available, the question of the volume of water required for that Scheme cannot be re-opened.
- (b) That, faced as they are with the unknown effect of the withdrawals which will be necessary for the supply of the Sutlej Valley Canals in the Punjab, the Government of Bombay have the right to object to further withdrawals from the Indus or its tributaries unless and until definite proof can be given that the supplies necessary for the Sukkur Barrage Project will not be endangered thereby.
- (c) That such proof must be based upon the results of the more accurate gaugings of the river and its tributaries which were instituted as a result of Sir Thomas Ward's note of the 10th. December 1920.

They added that, should the Punjab Government desire to proceed with the small experimental canal (a course which, in view of the uncertainties already referred to, appeared to them to be highly desirable before any sum approaching Rs. 7 crores was invested in the Thal, even should the experiment not prove directly productive), they were prepared to do their best to obtain the consent of the Government of Bombay to that scheme being taken in hand.

(28) These rulings were the subject of an immediate and lengthy protest from the Government of the Punjab. They enquired, in the first place, for how long the embargo placed upon their activities was to continue, and whether it was the intention that no further development should take place in the Punjab, until both the Sutlej Valley and Sukkur Barrage Projects had been in full operation for some years. They contended that the reference to the unknown effect upon the Sukkur supplies of the Sutlej Valley withdrawals was a direct contradiction of the Government of India's previous statement that they had satisfied themselves that there was sufficient water in the Indus for both projects. They held that the Government of India had, similarly, changed front as regards the Thal Project, quoting their letter of December 1921, in which it was agreed that a strong *prima facie* case had been made out for continuing and completing the surveys. They asserted that their requirements had been subordinated to those of Sind when the Sukkur Barrage Project was sanctioned, and that that scheme should have been postponed until the rival claims of the Bhakra Dam and Thal Projects had been considered and adjudicated upon. They advanced the argument that it was more economical to bring under irrigation areas at present lying waste than to utilise supplies for the conversion of inundation into perennial irrigation. They referred again to the possible fate of the Sind Sagar Doab Colonization Act if the commencement of the Thal Project were any longer delayed, and, in conclusion, they asked that the whole matter might be referred to the Secretary of State, and that he should be asked to convene an impartial Committee of experts to decide whether the experience gained of the Indus discharges, together with such material as had been collected by the Punjab Irrigation Department were not sufficient to show that the Lesser Thal Canal could be executed without detriment to the Sukkur Barrage Scheme. They went even further and suggested that the Committee should decide whether, even if this did not prove to be the case, the proper and most effective use of the Indus water would not justify some reduction of the irrigation proposed under the latter scheme.

(29) In reply to the specific points of substance raised in this letter, we explained that all that the rulings of Lord Reading's Government were intended to convey was, firstly, that they were not prepared to reopen the question of the duties on which the discharges of the Sukkur Barrage Canals were based and, secondly, that before any further extension of irrigation could be permitted in either province, evidence, based on accurate gaugings, must be available sufficient to show beyond any reasonable doubt that the supplies necessary for schemes already sanctioned would not be endangered thereby. As, however, the Punjab Government held that they had figures to justify their contention that it was possible to withdraw from the Indus the volume required for the Thal Canal without adversely affecting the supply at Sukkur, we stated our willingness, should both local Governments agree, to refer to a Committee, consisting of Chief Engineers of other Provinces, the question of whether or not the data available were sufficient to determine this issue.

(30) The Punjab Government accepted this proposal but refused to acquiesce in the position that the volume of water allotted to the Sukkur Barrage Canals had been finally and definitely fixed and was not open to any re-adjustment. The Government of Bombay also accepted, although with considerable reluctance. They pointed out that it was hardly open to argument that the data available were insufficient for a reliable conclusion to be drawn from them. Sir Thomas Ward had definitely stated, that, in December, 1920, no such data existed ; the gauging operations since initiated as a result of his recommendations had been in progress for less than five years, the observations of two of which were admittedly defective. They held, therefore, that if the Committee, on the data available, arrived at any conclusion it could only be a conclusion based on inference, and the success of the Sukkur Project was so vital to Sind that they were not prepared to risk it until definite proof, as distinct from inference, was available that the Thal Project would not affect its supply. Therefore, while accepting the proposal for reference of the question to a Committee, they reserved to themselves the right to appeal against any deductions and inferences the Committee might make or decision they might give.

(31) After consideration of these replies we informed both Governments, on the 15th. November 1926, that we had decided to convene a Committee to determine whether, on the data available, it is possible to afford an assurance to the Government of Bombay that, even after the Sutlej Valley Canals come into full operation, there will still remain sufficient water in the Indus and its tributaries to permit of further withdrawals being made in the Punjab for the proposed Thal Canal without in any material degree depriving the Sukkur Barrage and Canals Project in Sind of water allotted to it in its project estimate. We asked both local Governments to prepare statements of their cases before the 15th. February 1927 and proposed that the Committee should sit in Simla early in the following April to consider the question.

(32) The Punjab Government immediately protested against the terms of reference. They quoted the despatch with which the Sukkur Project had been forwarded to the Secretary of State for sanction and in which Lord Chelmsford's Government had expressed the opinion that there was no reason why duties similar to those ruling in the Punjab should not eventually be obtained in Sind, and asked that the question to be placed before the Committee should be, firstly, what were the supplies required by the Sukkur Barrage Scheme if similar duties to those obtained in the Punjab were taken as the basis of calculation and, secondly, whether on the basis of these duties the supplies in the Indus were sufficient to permit of further withdrawals being made in the Punjab for the proposed Thal Canal.

(33) In reply, we expressed our inability to accede to the local Government's request. It was true that Lord Chelmsford's Government, in forwarding the Sukkur Project, had expressed the view that the Punjab duties would "eventually" be obtained in Sind but it was clear from the fact that lower duties had actually been incorporated in the project that they had no anticipation that the Punjab figures would be realised in the earliest years of operation, except in years of abnormally low supply. There was, we pointed out, a wide difference between the expression of an opinion that, in a year of scarcity, higher duties than normal would be obtained and the taking of action artificially to reduce the supply in normal years. We saw no reason to believe that, in the earlier stages of perennial irrigation in Sind, higher duties than those assumed in the project would be realised and we were not prepared to consider an alteration of those duties, arrived at after full consideration of all the varying factors in the case, before the work was even constructed or the canals began to irrigate.

(34) The Bombay Government's statement of their case was received upon the due date but nothing further was heard from the Government of the Punjab, until, in a letter dated the 25th. March 1927, they preferred an appeal against our ruling. They stated that that decision, if it was to hold good, would have the result of entitling the Bombay Government to the unquestioned use of a large quantity of water which, in the opinion of the Punjab Government, could be more profitably and economically utilised, and that it would stand between themselves and the Bombay Government whenever it was proposed to make any extension of irrigation in the Punjab. They, therefore, requested either that the reference to the Committee should be on the lines proposed by them, the supplies required at Sukkur being based upon the duties obtained in the Punjab, or that, if we were unable to agree, the terms of reference should be referred for the decision of your Lordship.

(35) Before discussing the issues arising out of the local Government's request, it may perhaps be convenient to mention briefly and set aside the various matters which, although germane to any decision upon the larger question, do not directly affect the point upon which an immediate ruling is required.

(36) We are not concerned at present with the merits or otherwise of the Thal Project. It is, however, certain that, even should sufficient water for it subsequently prove to be available, that scheme will have to be submitted to an exceptionally careful examination before we shall be in a position to recommend it for construction. Its history is evidently such as to emphasize the need of very careful examination ; there appears

to have been a considerable difference of opinion regarding it even among the local Government's own experts, seeing that four entirely different projects for it, each advocating a different treatment of the area, have been put forward during the course of the last eight years. The Punjab Government have admitted that there are several uncertain factors in the scheme, two of which, the possibility of the soil proving unculturable without extensive manuring and the doubt as to the fertility or otherwise of the Indus silt, were regarded by them less than three years ago as so serious that they were unwilling to proceed with a comprehensive project until they had arrived at some definite conclusion based on experiment. Other factors which will have to be considered are whether the introduction of irrigation into a country which consists of isolated patches of more or less culturable land surrounded by sand-hills will not result in the water logging of the whole tract, whether it will ever be possible to maintain in proper order distributaries constructed through these sand-hills and, finally, whether the opening up of a new area for colonization will not retard development in the Sutlej Valley area, not only in British territory but in Bahawalpur also. In view of the great excess over the estimate of the latter project, which has resulted in the State being called upon to find several crores of rupees more than were originally anticipated and more than they originally agreed to find, both we and the Punjab Government have a peculiar responsibility for seeing that no action is taken which will tend to interfere with the success of the Bahawalpur colonization scheme. Much of the land in that State is of very poor quality and the offer of land in the Thal might well prove a counter-attraction to intending colonists.

(37) We are not at present concerned with the Punjab Government's contention that their claims have been subordinated to those of Sind, or with their argument that the Sukkur Barrage Project should have been postponed until the rival claims of the Thal, Bhakra Dam and Haveli Projects had been considered and adjudicated upon. The position adopted by the local Government is, however, in our opinion hardly reasonable. Perennial canals, irrigating between 8 and 9 million acres, drawing their supplies from tributaries of the Indus, have already been constructed in the Punjab whereas, until the Sukkur Barrage Project was sanctioned, not a single such scheme existed in Sind. Moreover acceptance of the Barrage Project was accompanied by the simultaneous acceptance of a new scheme of equal magnitude for the benefit of the Punjab and its neighbouring States. There can, therefore, be no real question of the subordination of Punjab interests. As regards the local Government's contention that the Sukkur Scheme should not have been sanctioned until all probable future projects in the Punjab had been investigated and adjudicated upon, it is clear that it would have been no more unreasonable for the Government of Bombay to urge that the Sutlej Valley Project should not have been taken in hand until the Sukkur Scheme had reached its full development and until all further possible schemes, such as that for a barrage to protect lower Sind, had been investigated and their needs secured.

(38) Nor are we immediately concerned with the difficult question of the supplies in the Indus, which will be a matter to be considered by the proposed Committee, if and when appointed. But a word as to the present position in this regard may not be out of place. Sir Thomas Ward was undoubtedly correct in saying that, in December 1920, no data were available which could possibly be regarded as of sufficient accuracy to settle a case of this magnitude; such discharges as had been recorded had been taken by rough and ready methods, often by untrained observers, and no real reliance could be placed on figures thus obtained. The systematic gaugings which he recommended were commenced in the autumn of 1921, but the results of 1921-22 and 1922-23 are defective inasmuch as the discharges in the Punjab have been calculated from surface float observations, which involve the use of a more or less arbitrary coefficient. Current meter observations were introduced in 1923-24, and it is only from that year that the records can be regarded as thoroughly reliable. There exist, therefore, accurate records for three years only, while those of a fourth are now being taken.

(39) Clearly, the gaugings have continued for far too short a period to enable final conclusions to be drawn from them; indeed, the two officers in charge of the operations, in their report on the gaugings up to 1925, the only one which has so far been published, admit that the figures show certain irreconcilable discrepancies which can only be cleared up by further observations in coming years, and that deductions drawn from them can only be tentative. But it is interesting to note that, in so far as they go, they afford but little support to the theory of the regeneration of water which was dealt with in paragraph 15 of the despatch of Lord Chelmsford's Government of the 16th December 1920, with which the Sukkur Barrage Project was submitted for sanction, and which has been much quoted by the Punjab engineers in support of their contention that it is possible to abstract water in that province without affecting the supplies at Sukkur on the ground that the water so abstracted percolates back into the river.

(40) The only point which is, at the moment, at issue is whether it is desirable to reopen the question of the volume of water allotted to the Sukkur Barrage Canals with a view to its reduction in order to make additional water available for use in the Punjab. There can, we consider, hardly be two impartial opinions in this matter. The duties upon which these discharges are based were selected, in the first instance, by a committee consisting of two expert officers, one a revenue and one an irrigation officer, both with long experience of conditions in Sind. They were accepted by the Government of India's technical advisers as reasonable only after a careful

consideration of all the circumstances of the case. As there is, at present, little or no perennial irrigation in Sind, there was bound to be an element of guess-work in the choice of factors and any revision of them at present would be of exactly the same nature. Having in view the different climatic conditions in the Punjab and Sind, and more especially the almost complete absence of rain and greater sunheat in the latter, it is impossible to postulate that the results obtained in one province should also, as a matter of course, be obtained in the other. The Government of the Punjab argue that the duties adopted are too low and that the supplies allotted to the project are extravagant; some of the opponents of the project, on the other hand, have urged that the duties are too high and that the scheme is doomed to failure because it will prove impossible to irrigate the area anticipated with the water available. There has even been some slight difference of opinion on the subject among the experts of the Government of India. Sir Thomas Ward, who was advising Lord Chelmsford's Government when the project was submitted for sanction, considered that, while the duties adopted were reasonable, they would probably eventually be exceeded and permit of an extension of the irrigated area; Sir Frederick Gebbie, on the other hand, who had an unrivalled knowledge of conditions in Sind, took a less optimistic view and considered that they would not even be worked up to until after many years of operation and until the people learnt to use water much more economically than they have done in the past under the inundation system. Nothing but experience will ever show exactly what value should be taken for these duties; *prima facie* those adopted for the purpose of the project are approximately correct and certainly no ground has been shewn for a reconsideration of them before the scheme even begins to irrigate. The Punjab Government would have them examined by a committee; it would, however, be almost impossible to convene a committee whose views would carry weight against those of the several experts, revenue and irrigation, who selected and approved the figures now adopted.

(41) Even were the Sukkur Scheme still in the project stage, and the question of the duties to be adopted under consideration *ab initio*, there is no reason to suppose that duties different from those actually adopted would be recommended. But this is not the position. Work on the project is now well advanced, and the Government of Bombay have invested crores of rupees in it on the understanding that a certain volume of water, a volume accepted as reasonable both by the Secretary of State and by the Government of India, will be reserved for its use. To raise the question of an arbitrary reduction of that volume, at this stage, before any test of its sufficiency or otherwise is possible, would give the local Government a most serious cause of complaint. Not only would they feel themselves threatened with action likely to lead to the failure of the scheme, but they would probably find themselves constrained to cease work altogether upon the project until a decision was arrived at. The canals now being excavated are of the dimensions necessary to deal with the allotted discharge; were this discharge reduced to about two-thirds of the project figure, as the Punjab Government suggest, the whole scheme would have to be redesigned and much, if not all, of the work so far done would require to be remodelled.

(42) There is no project in India which has been the cause of so much dissension as has the Sukkur Project. It has been violently opposed by a coterie of retired officials in England, to whose views considerable publicity has been given; it has been the subject of discussion in the House of Lords on more than one occasion; and it has, during the last few months, been attacked by a section of the Bombay Legislative Council and of the Bombay press who, solely because it was inaugurated during the Governorship of His Excellency Lord Lloyd, have attempted to couple it with the Back Bay Reclamation Scheme. It is not too much to say that the whole future prosperity of Sind is bound up with the Sukkur Barrage Project, and there is every reason to believe that it will achieve the success forecasted for it when the estimate was sanctioned. But the attacks upon it have, undoubtedly, not been without their effect and, while we do not believe that an impartial committee would come to any conclusion other than that at which our expert advisers have already arrived, we can conceive of nothing that would deal a greater blow to public confidence than a sudden announcement that a material reduction of the volume of water reserved for it was under consideration.

\* \* \* \* \*

3. In reply to that Despatch, the Secretary of State refused the request of the Punjab to reopen the question of supplies allotted to Sind at the Sukkur Barrage, in his Despatch Irrigation No. 2 to His Excellency the Governor General in Council dated London, 25th. August 1927 from which the following paragraphs are quoted.

\* \* \* \* \*

(2) I note that Your Excellency's Government are not at present concerned with two of the three main points involved in the dispute, *viz.*, (1) contention of the Government of the Punjab that their claims have been subordinated to those of Sind, and that the Sukkur Barrage Project should have been postponed until the rival claims of the Thal, Bhakra Dam and Haveli projects had been considered and adjudicated on; and (2) the adequacy of the supply of water in the Indus for all Punjab projects without detriment to the requirements of Sind.

(3) The only point upon which my orders are required at present is the request of the Punjab Government that the question of the volume of water allotted to the Sukkur Barrage Project should be reopened with a view to its reduction, in order to make additional water available for use in the Punjab.

(4) The Punjab Government contend that the supply of water allotted to the Sukkur Barrage Project is extravagant and that the project would be adequately served were the duties prescribed for it increased to correspond with those obtained in the Punjab. In support of this contention they appear to rely mainly on the opinion expressed by Sir Thomas Ward, late Inspector-General of Irrigation in India, and accepted by Lord Chelmsford's Government (*vide* para. 15 of their Despatch No. 23, Public Works, dated 16th. December 1920), that "there is no reason whatever why similar duties (to those in the Punjab) should not eventually be obtained in Sind."

(5) Your Excellency's Government, however, consider, and have already pointed out to the Punjab Government, that it is obvious, from the use of the word "eventually" and from the fact that lower duties were actually incorporated in the Sukkur project, that Lord Chelmsford's Government did not anticipate that the Punjab figures would be realised in the earlier years of its operation, except in years of abnormally low supply. Sir F. Gebbie, whose knowledge of conditions in Sind was unrivalled, was even less optimistic, and considered that the duties would not be worked up to until after many years of operation and until the people of Sind learned to use water much more economically than they had done in the past.

(6) I accept the conclusion of Your Excellency's Government that nothing but experience can show exactly what value should be taken for these duties, and I agree that, having regard to the fact that the Sukkur canals have not yet even begun to irrigate, no reason has been shown for a reconsideration of the duties. I also attach great weight to the other arguments advanced by Your Excellency's Government in the concluding paragraphs of your Despatch, and am led to the conclusion that it would be unreasonable in itself, and unfair to the Government of Bombay, to reopen the question of the duties at the present time.

(7) The Government of the Punjab should accordingly be informed that I regret that after full consideration I am unable to accede to their request.

### Indus Discharge Committee.

4. Consequent upon the issue of a Note (1) by Sir Thomas Ward, Inspector General of Irrigation, dated 10th. December 1920, the Governments of Bombay and the Punjab, acting on the recommendation of the Government of India, instituted a comprehensive system of gauge and discharge observations at all the important sites in Sind and the Punjab, on the Indus and its tributaries.

Under their letter No. 444-I, dated 7th. September 1921, the Government of India established a special committee for the tabulation, co-ordination and scrutiny of the results obtained by the executive engineers appointed by the two Provincial Governments to carry out these observations.

The executive engineers met frequently to exchange notes, correlate their methods and compare their results. Consequently, when the Committee, known as the Indus Discharge Committee held its first important meeting in June 1928 at Simla with Mr. D. G. Harris, Consulting Engineer to the Government of India as Chairman, there was a considerable volume of authentic data to be examined.

5. At this first meeting of the full Committee the following were present:—

Mr. D. G. HARRIS .. ..	.. ..	Consulting Engineer to Government of India.
Mr. R. T. HARRISON .. ..	.. ..	Bombay.
Mr. J. B. G. SMITH .. ..	.. ..	Punjab.
Mr. H. F. ASHTON .. ..	.. ..	Punjab.
Mr. D. R. SATARAWALA .. ..	.. ..	Bombay.
Mr. W. G. QUINTON .. ..	.. ..	{ Joint Secretaries.
Mr. P. C. THADANI .. ..	.. ..	

The term of reference laid down by the Committee for its own guidance was "to determine the history of the water of the Indus and its tributaries during its passage through the Punjab and Sind to Sukkur".

6. The principal point which emerges from a consideration of the published proceedings is the very great importance of the amount of water lost or gained between the various discharge sites, *i.e.* the volume absorbed or regenerated in the river beds between the points of observation.

A definite attempt was made to treat the subject mathematically—an attempt which subsequent experience has proved to have been fruitless.

Nevertheless, the proceedings of the Committee served to concentrate attention on this important matter. It is not too much to say that the results obtained from the attention subsequently devoted to this aspect of the problem, have gone far to permit of the agreed solution of the problem, reached subsequently.

7. The next meeting of the Indus Discharge Committee took place at Bombay in March 1929.

The following were present:—

Mr. D. G. HARRIS .. ..	..	..	Consulting Engineer to Government of India.	to
Mr. R. T. HARRISON .. ..	..	..	Bombay.	
Mr. N. WHITE .. ..	..	..	Punjab.	
Mr. J. B. G. SMITH .. ..	..	..	Punjab.	
Mr. D. R. SATARAWALA .. ..	..	..	Bombay.	
Mr. H. B. PARIKH .. ..	..	..	} Joint Secretaries.	
Mr. NOKCHAND .. ..	..	..		

For purposes of this narrative the important parts of the proceedings are contained in the unanimous recommendations quoted below—

\* \* \* \* \*

(12) In paragraph 26 of our last Report, we expressed the hope that we might discover some means of predicting accurately the effect upon the supply at Sukkur of further withdrawals of water in the Punjab whether by projects under construction or in prospect. As we have already explained, this hope has not been realized. But, although we have to admit that the data which have so far been collected are insufficient to enable any definite quantitative determination of the effect of such withdrawals to be made, our study of the figures affords us, we consider, sufficient ground for making recommendations as to whether and if so, what further withdrawals are justifiable.

(13) We are unanimous in agreeing that it would be unjustifiable to withdraw from the Indus at Kalabagh the perennial supply required for the Lesser Thal Project. We do not think that it is possible on the data now available to show that this supply can be taken without materially affecting the supplies allotted to the Sukkur Barrage Project in its project estimate. This conclusion should be regarded as open to reconsideration after further gaugings have been taken over a series of years; even should no prediction formula capable of physical interpretation be reached as a result of such gaugings, at least the effect of the Sutlej Valley Project upon the supplies at Sukkur and the existence or otherwise of surpluses capable of beneficial utilization will be definitely known. We consider that ten years' further gaugings will be necessary before any final conclusion can be reached in the matter and we recommend that all idea of any new canal drawing its water direct from the Indus should be held in abeyance during this period.

(14) On the other hand, we agree that a certain small perennial supply can be made available for utilization in the Punjab from the tributary components of the river. This supply should be limited to 1,250 cubic feet a second during the winter months from the 15th. October to the 20th. April. The Government of Bombay have already consented to the utilization by the Government of Punjab of a volume of 500 cubic feet a second for the Jalalpur pumping scheme and we consider that this volume might be increased by 750 cubic feet a second, leaving it to the discretion of the Punjab Government how and where it shall be utilized, provided always, as already stated, that it is drawn from the tributaries and not from the main river. We have no accurate means of knowing to what extent this withdrawal will affect the supplies at Sukkur, but it seems to us probable that the effect will be of the order of 750 cubic feet a second which is well within the margin of error of the measurements of the discharges at the latter place. Should the Government of the Punjab desire to proceed with the Haveli project in preference to the Jalalpur scheme, we understand that the freeing of this volume of water will enable them to do so; we see no difficulty in making available the volume of approximately 7,500 cubic feet a second required for the scheme from the 20th. April onwards. It may further be remarked that, in making this recommendation, we are influenced by the fact that, in a bad year, the volume available in the

tributaries during the winter months will be considerably less than the volume which we have suggested as the maximum to be withdrawn, so that, in such a year, the effect on the discharge at Sukkur will be proportionately smaller.

(15) We now come to the proposal for a dam on the Sutlej at Bhakra which is at present under the consideration of both the Governments concerned. The original Bhakra Dam Project provided for a dam 400 feet high which would store  $2\frac{1}{2}$  million acre feet ; the revised project now under consideration provides for a dam 500 feet high with a storage capacity of  $4\frac{3}{4}$  million acre feet. We understand from our colleagues from the Punjab that the smaller project not only presents greater engineering difficulties but is likely to be financially unremunerative and, therefore, that it is not a question of a choice between the two projects but of a choice between the larger scheme and the leaving of the *kharif* supplies of the river unutilized.

(16) We would state, in the first instance, that we are unanimous in agreeing that the solution of the problem of the further extension of irrigation in the Punjab lies primarily in the conservation of the *kharif* supplies which at present run waste to the sea. The quantity of water available is sufficient for the larger scheme and the only objection which can be raised against it is its effect upon the inundation canals in Sind which have their heads between Mithankot and Sukkur. Even when the dam is in operation there will be water and to spare for these canals, but it is apprehended that the effect of the great reduction in the flood volume of the river, due to storage at Bhakra, will be to lower the levels at their heads to such an extent that both the number of days during which the fair irrigating level will be reached and the number of days during which the canals will actually flow at all will be considerably diminished. On the other hand, it has been argued, and diagrams showing conditions elsewhere have been placed before us in support of the contention, that the effect will be less serious than might at first sight seem probable owing to the fact that, with the alteration in the flood regime of the river, a rise in its bed and a consequent rise in the level of the water is to be anticipated.

(17) The problem is a complicated one and is one which requires considerable investigation. Although we are unable, on the data available, to suggest the correct solution, we are most unwilling to believe that no such solution exists. We therefore recommend that each Government should place an officer, with the rank of Superintending Engineer, on special duty, and that these officers should be charged to make a joint investigation of the matter and submit a joint report upon it. In this report, they will discuss the probable effects of the Bhakra scheme upon the Sind inundation canals, taking into consideration the possibility of a change of regime such as already mentioned, as also the possibility of any detriment likely to accrue being counteracted by a change in the conditions of cropping. They will also consider what steps are possible to reduce any anticipated detrimental effect to a minimum, whether by restoring the levels in the Indus, by altering the positions of the heads of the canals, or by other means which may seem to them to be suitable. We have great hopes that, when this report is forthcoming, it will be possible to devise measures which will permit of the Bhakra scheme going forward.

(18) There is one other point to which we should like to refer. Owing to a miscalculation of the absorption losses, certain of the canals in the Sukkur Barrage Scheme have been designed so as to draw off a larger volume of water than that allotted to them in the project estimate and the question has arisen whether this procedure is legitimate. We can see no objection to it provided that no prescriptive right to the additional water is claimed by the Government of Bombay and that it is merely a case of their utilizing the water, when available, instead of letting it run waste to the sea.

## Committee on the Bhakra Dam Project

8. Consequent upon the recommendation reproduced in paragraph 7(17) above, two superintending engineers met and formed the "Committee on the probable effects of the Bhakra Dam Scheme on the inundation canals of the Indus between Mithi, Lut and Sialkot".

The two officers were:

Mr. H. W. NICHOLSON, C.I.E., I.S.E. . . Punjab  
and

Mr. W. L. C. TRENCH, L.S.E. .... Bombay

Their report was unanimous and was addressed to Secretaries to Governments of the Punjab and Bombay. Public Works Department, Irrigation Branch, dated 15th December 1929.

9. Again, for purposes of this narrative, the important part of their conclusions is recorded under—

## VIII

### Recommendations.

(1) \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

(2) We are therefore of opinion that the inundation canals in the Mithankot-Sukkur reach of the Indus, from Kashmore at the head of the Desert canal to the Begari canal, will not suffer any reduction of supply and that the canals from the Sind canal to Sukkur will obtain better supplies of water when the Bhakra Dam Project has come into effect, than they receive at the present time.

(3) \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

10. Mr. Trench attached a note as an appendix to the report " Appendix 9—Note dated December 15th, 1930, on the effects of the Bhakra Dam withdrawals on Canals below Sukkur ". His conclusion, with which Mr. Nicholson concurred, is contained in paragraph 20 thereof.

" In these circumstances, and in view of the fact that, on the most unfavourable hypothesis the reduction of levels in the canals are small it does not appear probable that conditions 10 or 12 years hence, the earliest date on which the Bhakra withdrawals could take effect, will be any worse for the inundation canals below Sukkur than they are at the present day, and, in fact, owing to regime rises, conditions may be better, even allowing for the estimated adverse effects of the Bhakra Scheme withdrawal.

11. It may be recorded here that subsequently, in their letter No. 2337/27-I., dated 27th. March 1934 the Government of Bombay addressed the Government of the Punjab and intimated that they would offer no opposition to the construction of the Bhakra Dam.

### Claims of Parties interested in the Waters of the Indus in 1931.

12. In 1931, the position of the various parties interested in the waters of the Indus and its tributaries may be summarized as under.

BOMBAY (SIND).—The authorized withdrawals (*vide* page 7 of Volume V of Sukkur Barrage Canal Project 1919-20) at Sukkur, for the British canals was as under.

Month.	Discharge (cusecs).					
January	..	..	..	..	..	22,656
February	..	..	..	..	..	22,656
March	..	..	..	..	..	23,454
April	..	..	..	..	..	27,029
May	..	..	..	..	..	36,543
June	..	..	..	..	..	41,896
July	..	..	..	..	..	41,896
August	..	..	..	..	..	41,896
September	..	..	..	..	..	41,896
October	..	..	..	..	..	22,897
November	..	..	..	..	..	20,540
December	..	..	..	..	..	22,656

Including 400 cusecs for  
Khaipur State lands on  
Eastern Nara Canal.

KHAIRPUR STATE.—In addition to the withdrawals for British Sind the authorized withdrawals for the Khairpur feeders at Sukkur, were as under.

Month.	Discharge (cusecs).
January to March	nil.
April	2,000
May	3,000
June	4,030
July	4,030
August	4,030
September	4,030
October	3,000
November	3,000
December	3,000

It is not clearly laid down whether the above are maximum discharges or mean monthly withdrawals. It was the contention of Bombay that they were to be regarded as the latter. During the meetings of the Committee 1st. to 8th. March 1935, on the evidence before them, the INDEPENDENT MEMBERS concluded that maximum discharges were intended.

Moreover the Government of India, in their letter No. I.R.6, dated the 29th. June 1929 accorded sanction to withdrawals in excess of the maxima laid down on the distinct understanding that no "prescriptive right" to such excesses was claimed at a later date. It may be inferred therefore, that surplus water was intended to be held available for distribution elsewhere.

### 13. PUNJAB.

*Thal Lesser Project.*—It had been agreed that the question of allotting supplies from the river Indus should not be reopened till 1939 by which time, it was anticipated that sufficient reliable data as to water available, would be to hand.

*Haveli Project.*—The Government of Bombay had agreed to the allocation of water from the Chenab, to the Haveli project as under—

Rabi.	Kharif.
-------	---------

1,250	7,500 (approx.)
-------	-----------------

*vide* paragraph 4 under Preliminary, of Report on Haveli Project, 1932, Part I or, (14) under para. 7 of this Part.

*Sutlej Valley Project.*—Along with the other partners in this system of canals, the Punjab was bound by the Agreement "between the British Government and the Government of His Highness the Nawab of Bahawalpur and His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner regarding the irrigation of the tracts commanded and economically irrigable from the Gharra Reach of the Sutlej River and from the Panjnad Reach of the Chenab River."

The Punjab did not advance any demand that the Agreement should be altered in any particular.

14. NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE.—At this stage the Frontier Province had not entered the discussions, although that Government had asked the Governments of Bombay and the Punjab to agree to certain small withdrawals from the Indus for the Paharpur canal. These proposed withdrawals had not been opposed by the Bombay or the Punjab Governments.

15. BAHAWALPUR.—Bahawalpur was a partner in the Sutlej Valley Project and a signatory to the Tripartite Agreement. From the first, Bahawalpur had objected to the inclusion of Bikaner in the scheme, holding that the water supplies in the Gharra reach of the Sutlej were insufficient for the riverain partners, *viz.* Punjab and Bahawalpur.

This "shortage" was particularly marked during early kharif.

Moreover, one headworks, the Panjnad, was actually situated on the Chenab below its confluence with the Sutlej. The supplies which Bahawalpur might extract from the Chenab at Panjnad were restricted by clause 4. D. 2 of the Tripartite Agreement.

"For the perennial and non-perennial canals for Bahawalpur from the Panjnad the mean draw-off in each crop shall be maintained at the same fraction of their authorized maximum capacity in cusecs as that of the British canals from the Gharra."

Whatever be the reason for insertion of this clause (2), the fact remains that the withdrawals authorized at Panjnad were considerably less than the water available in the river at certain critical periods.

The Bahawalpur Darbar therefore held that available supplies should be shared fairly between the Haveli and Panjnad canals, and that the withdrawals at Panjnad should not be dependent on the supplies in the Gharra reach of the Sutlej.

16. BIKANER.—Bikaner State, also a partner in the Sutlej Valley Project, had only one perennial canal taking off at Ferozepur. The opening of the non-perennial channels on 1st. April, on a low river, with the consequent change in amount of its share of the water available, often created difficulty.

Bikaner had never accepted the views put forward by Bahawalpur on the subject of riparian rights (para. 15). Neither did the State Authorities admit the deficiency of supplies in the Gharra reach of the Sutlej, for the irrigation of suitable perennial areas within the Sutlej Valley Project.

Finally, the culturable areas commanded by the Bikaner canal were found to be more extensive than anticipated. Consequently the State Authorities had grounds for pressing for additional supplies.

#### Subsequent Developments.

17. The events which ultimately led to the convening of a specially constituted Committee under the ægis of the Central Board of Irrigation to re-examine the problem, sprang from three different sources—

- (a) the Punjab claim to additional supplies for the Haveli project to ensure its success as a productive scheme,
- (b) the claims of Khairpur State to perennial water,
- (c) the Bahawalpur demand that clause 4. D. 2 of the Tripartite Agreement should be deleted and various adjustments made in its irrigable areas, authorized discharges, etc. to place the Bahawalpur canal system on a productive basis.

Obviously, the claims set out as (b) and (c) above, required immediate settlement.

18. It is impossible to describe these developments in chronological order. A clear understanding of the position will be possible only by taking each claim and reviewing briefly how it arose and what it implied.

In para. 13, it is stated that the Government of Bombay had agreed to the reservation of the following supplies for the Haveli project.

Rabi .. .. ..	1,250 cusecs maximum withdrawal.
Kharif .. .. ..	7,500 do. do. do.

A subsequent review of the project in the light of the existing agricultural depression, led to the Government of the Punjab revising its demands on the Chenab water for the Haveli, to ensure that the full rabi area should be sown in October and November and thus present a remunerative project.

The new demands were as under :—

Rabi .. .. ..	2,750 cusecs maximum withdrawal.
Kharif .. .. ..	7,500 do. do. do.

(Kharif demand now increased to 7,750 cusecs in Punjab Brief.)

19. In para. 12 the authorized withdrawals for Khairpur feeders, are stated.

In connection with the financial settlement between Khairpur State and the Government of Bombay, in respect of the Sukkur Barrage Project, it was contended on behalf of Khairpur State that unless a perennial supply were given, the State would in fact, receive little benefit from the Barrage. Their old inundation

(2) At the meeting of the Committee on "Distribution of Waters of Indus and its Tributaries" 1st. to 8th. March 1935, Mr. Nicholson (Punjab) explained that this was done to protect the interests of the Haveli and Thal Projects.

canals had been most efficient and had given a supply almost equivalent to that described in para. 12. It was urged that the State was entitled to a perennial supply.

### Additional Supplies of Water allowed temporarily to Khairpur.

20. While this dispute was in progress, the Government of Bombay (Sind) had permitted the Khairpur State to withdraw an enhanced rabi supply for their feeders, as a temporary measure as an act of grace.

This was rendered possible by reason of the water allocated to the Haveli, not being utilized and therefore reaching Sukkur, by the fact that no supplies had been allocated to the Thal *vide para. 7 (13)*, and by reason of the Barrage canals not having attained their full development.

Consequently, the Sind authorities did not anticipate any serious shortage. Moreover, sanction had been accorded to their utilizing supplies available at Sukkur, subject to no "prescriptive right" being claimed subsequently to the increased monthly withdrawals (*paras. 12 and 24*).

In their letter No. P. W. D. 3079/27-IV, dated the 30th. August 1934, addressed to the Government of India, Foreign and Political Department, the Government of Bombay expressed their inability to guarantee to Khairpur State, the rabi supply which they enjoyed temporarily, except on certain conditions. The chief of these conditions was an increase in the maximum authorized withdrawal at Sukkur. This letter was one of the principle reasons leading to the decision of the Government of India to investigate the problem *ab initio* at the earliest possible moment.

### Sutlej Valley Project Enquiry Committee, Bahawalpur, 1932.

21. In Bahawalpur, for reasons only remotely connected with this narrative, a committee had been convened, *viz.* the "Sutlej Valley Project Enquiry Committee, Bahawalpur, 1932" to examine what alterations in the Bahawalpur canal system were necessary to place the canals on a productive basis.

The recommendations in the report of the above Committee, comprised :—

- (a) the abandoning of unfertile lands,
- (b) the irrigation of certain additional good land not previously served by the State canals,
- (c) the conversion of suitable non-perennial areas into perennial,
- (d) the adjustment *inter se* of the areas served by the various canals to obtain a more efficient service,
- (e) the construction of certain new feeders,
- (f) in particular, the deletion of clause 4. D. 2 from the Tripartite Agreement.

22. For purposes of this narrative, the most important of the proposals was in the last recorded recommendation, which had as its object the removal of the restriction on the authorized withdrawals at Panjnad headworks.

Under the Agreement, as interpreted at this time, the average permissible rabi supply for the Abbassia canal in normal years at the Panjnad headworks was 516 cusecs. Bahawalpur demanded a mean supply of 930<sup>(3)</sup> cusecs and proposed to take this supply down the Panjnad canal. They further required that the early kharif supply should not be restricted as laid down in the Tripartite Agreement.

### Additional Supplies of Water allowed temporarily to Bahawalpur.

For the years 1932-33 to 1934-35 no restriction on the draw-off had been imposed by the Government of the Punjab, as an act of grace. The concession was rendered possible by the fact that the authorized supplies for the Haveli project were not being withdrawn. Nevertheless, to prevent the possibility of any prescriptive claim to the water being established by Bahawalpur, the Government of the Punjab in their letter No. 3841 S. Con., dated 6th. September 1934, to the A. G. G. Punjab States, intimated that this concession would not be granted after 1st. April 1935 and that after that date the Agreement would be strictly enforced.

(3) Sutlej Valley Project Enquiry Committee, Bahawalpur, Report : Statement No. II, pp. 32.



This ultimatum was another factor in determining the decision of the Government of India to submit the dispute to investigation.

23. So far the Government of India had four disputants to reconcile. It was clear that other interested parties should be invited to participate in the discussions, but equally clearly, it was possible that any one might refuse to do so on the ground that no possible advantage would accrue from altering the existing state of affairs.

Certain minor considerations, however, determined the attitude of the other INTERESTED PARTIES.

#### Claim by Sind to increased maximum withdrawals at Sukkur.

24. In the case of Sind, an attempt had been made to secure sanction to an increase in the authorized maximum withdrawals at the Barrage.

In their letter No. I.R.-6, dated the 29th June 1929 to the Government of Bombay, the Government of India plainly intimated that sanction to an increase in authorized maxima would not be accorded. But in the same letter, permission was accorded to Sind to make use of excess supplies in the river at Sukkur, subject to no "prescriptive right" to such excesses being claimed subsequently.

Unfortunately, this correspondence was not communicated to the Punjab, and as will be seen later, this omission affected the Punjab attitude in the dispute.

Lastly, owing to a miscalculation in the original Sukkur Barrage Project, allowance for increased withdrawals during the overlapping period kharif-rabi in the month of October on certain canals had been omitted.

The Government of Bombay agreed to participate in the enquiry, because they considered, on the grounds advanced by the Government of India, that such an enquiry to settle all outstanding questions, was desirable, indeed necessary.

25. In the case of the North-West Frontier Province, the only reason for their participation was that their commitments on the Indus, the Paharpur canal in particular, rendered the presence of a representative with a watching brief, advisable in their own interests.

#### Attitude of Bikaner State.

26. Bikaner State was in a very different position. Whatever readjustment in the supplies allotted to Bahawalpur might eventuate Bikaner was vitally interested as a signatory to the Tripartite Agreement. No modification to the Agreement was possible without the consent of Bikaner and no such modification would be agreed to, unless it brought some amelioration of the conditions referred to in para. 16.

#### Genesis of the Committee on the Distribution of the Waters of the Indus and its Tributaries.

27. The urgent necessity to secure a settlement of the Bahawalpur and Khairpur claims led to the issue of letter No. I.R.-18, dated the 8th November 1934 (4) from the Government of India, to the Governments of Bombay and the Punjab. A copy of this letter was subsequently endorsed to the Foreign and Political Department to communicate to the States concerned.

In this letter, the Government of India reviewed the situation as then existing and stated briefly, the matters in dispute. The formation of the Committee was proposed and certain administrative matters in this connection, were discussed.

The terms of reference were stated. Observations on the proposed Committee, the procedure and terms of reference were invited.

28. In due course, the INTERESTED PARTIES accepted the proposals *in toto*, in some cases with small reservations.

(4) Owing to the importance of this letter, as the immediate origin of the Committee, it is reproduced *in extenso* as an Appendix to this Part III, see pp. 22.

Province.	Letter No. and date.	From	To
Bombay (Sind) ..	5997/27-I, dated the 19th. December 1934.	Secretary to the Government of Bombay, P. W. D., Bombay.	Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Industries and Labour, P. W. Branch.
Punjab .. ..	10561-Nor., dated the 6th. December 1934.	Secretary to the Government of the Punjab, P. W. D., Irrigation Branch.	Ditto.
N.W.F.P. .. ..	5170-P.W.-355-W., dated the 11th. December 1934.	Secretary to the Government of N.W.F.P., P. W. D.	Ditto.
Bahawalpur ..	I.G.-2004-C. 1263-33, dated the 20th. December 1934.	Agent to the Governor General, Punjab States.	Political Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign and Political Department.
Bikaner .. ..	3571, dated the 11th. December 1934.	Secretary, Foreign and Political Department, Bikaner State.	Secretary to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor General in Rajputana.
Khairpur .. ..	C.-114, dated the 11th. December 1934.	Minister, Khairpur State ..	Secretary to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor General, Punjab States

29. The Committee was to be formed of two members of the Central Board of Irrigation as **INDEPENDENT MEMBERS**, nominated by the Government of India.

Each **INTERESTED PARTY** was to nominate one member, who might bring with him such advisers as he deemed necessary, but such advisers would not be members of the Committee.

Secretary, Central Board of Irrigation was *ex-officio* Secretary to the Committee.

30. The final composition of the Committee was as under.

For convenience, gentlemen "in attendance" are also listed.

Central Board of Irrigation Members nominated by Government of India—

F. ANDERSON, Esq., C.I.E. I.S.E. (U. P.). *Chairman.*

F. A. BETTERTON, Esq., I.S.E. (B. & O.). *Vice Chairman.*

Bombay (Sind)—

W. L. C. TRENCH, Esq., I.S.E. *Member.*

MR. GURMUKHSINGH J. BUTANI, B.S.E. *In attendance.*

Punjab—

H. W. NICHOLSON, Esq., C.I.E., I.S.E. *Member.*

J. P. GUNN, Esq., I.S.E. *In attendance.*

North-West Frontier Province—

A. ORAM, Esq., I.S.E. *Member.*

Bahawalpur—

Sir BERNARD DARLEY, Kt., C.I.E. *Member.*

C. A. H. TOWNSEND, Esq., C.I.E. *In attendance*

Bikaner—

T. A. W. FOY, Esq., I.S.E. *Member.*

Rai Bahadur JAI GOPAL. *In attendance.*

Khairpur—

J. M. SLADEN, Esq., I.C.S. *Member.*

Khan Bahadur J. R. COLABAVALA }  
F. WRIGHT, Esq. } *In attendance.*

Secretary, Central Board of Irrigation—

A. M. R. MONTAGU, Esq., I.S.E. *Secretary.*

31. The first meeting of the Committee took place at Old Delhi at the Cecil Hotel. The Secretary arrived in Delhi on the 24th. February and the members of the Committee between the 25th. and 28th. February.

Proceedings were opened formally by the Hon'ble Sir Frank Noyce, Member for the Department of Industries and Labour, at 10-30 on the morning of the 1st. March. With this exception, business was conducted generally between the hours 9-00 a.m. and 5-00 p.m. daily, with a short interval for luncheon.

### Procedure.

32. The procedure adopted was laid down by the Chairman. From a study of the BRIEFS, the Chairman framed provisional ISSUES which covered the whole field of the enquiry without relation to the TERMS OF REFERENCE.

On the first day, these provisional ISSUES were examined and modified. These and the final ISSUES are recorded as an Appendix (5) to this volume. Thereafter the first business of each day, was the correction and confirmation of the recorded proceedings of the previous day.

Evidence was taken upon these ISSUES in turn. By mid-day on Wednesday 6th. March evidence was concluded, and the Chairman framed five POINTS FOR DISCUSSION, which are recorded as an Appendix (6).

The meeting was then adjourned to allow of the INTERESTED PARTIES discussing these POINTS informally with the evidence before them.

33. The INTERESTED PARTIES formed themselves into informal sub-committees to discuss these POINTS. The Committee as a whole re-assembled on Friday morning, 8th. March.

The agreements reached by the informal sub-committees were then recorded. POINTS on which the INTERESTED PARTIES were still at variance, were then discussed and agreement reached.

Certain matters, which strictly speaking, were outside the TERMS OF REFERENCE were then discussed, their importance, in the opinion of the Committee, justifying their place in the record.

At the conclusion of the session on Friday 8th. March 1935, the Chairman adjourned the Committee *sine die*.

34. Owing to the importance and urgent necessity of implementing certain of the agreements reached, the Chairman directed the preparation of an INTERIM REPORT. The draft was circulated to members of the Committee with letter No. 1301-F. 47, dated the 13th. March 1935 from Secretary, Central Board of Irrigation.

The INTERIM REPORT was despatched to the Government of India with letter No. 2090-F. 47, dated the 20th. April 1935 from the INDEPENDENT MEMBERS, Committee on Distribution of Waters of the Indus and its Tributaries.

### Second Meeting.

35. At the conclusion of the first meeting of the Committee at Delhi the Secretary prepared, in consultation with the INDEPENDENT MEMBERS, a draft of the Findings and Recommendations of the Committee, copies of which were forwarded to all Members for their approval or for suggestions for amendment. Upon receipt of replies from the Members it was evident that there were many points which remained to be discussed and settled before a unanimous report could be prepared. The INDEPENDENT MEMBERS therefore instructed the Secretary to call a second meeting of the Committee, which was held at Simla from the 17th. to the 20th. June, 1935. Messrs. T. A. W. Foy, and J. M. Sladen, representatives of Bikaner and Khairpur States respectively, had by this time proceeded on leave, so their places at the second meeting were taken by Rai Bahadur Jai Gopal, Colonization Minister, Bikaner State, and Mr. J. Booth, I.C.S., Minister, Khairpur State. The North-West Frontier Province did not send a representative to this meeting as the question

(5) Appendix II (A) & (B) pp. 99 & 100.

(6) Appendix III pp. 101.

with which they were concerned had been fully discussed at the first meeting. Mr. M. T. Gibling, I.S.E., who took over the post of Secretary, Central Board of Irrigation, on the 1st. May 1935, acted as Secretary to the Committee.

36. The procedure adopted at the second meeting was rather different from that of the first. The Secretary had prepared a revised draft of the Findings and Recommendations, based on the original draft and the remarks of the Members thereon, and it was decided at the commencement of the second meeting, to adopt the revised draft for discussion paragraph by paragraph. The proceedings were corrected where necessary and confirmed, in accordance with the procedure adopted at the first meeting. The discussion of the re-drafted Findings and Recommendations brought out several points which had not been dealt with at the first meeting, and all the questions were discussed in more detail. Unanimous decisions were reached on almost all points arising out of the discussion and they are produced in the Final Report as the Findings of the Committee. The INDEPENDENT MEMBERS have recorded their opinion on one or two points which could not be dealt with by the Committee as a whole.

37. Owing to the untimely death of Mr. H. W. Nicholson, C.I.E., Punjab representative, after a short illness, before the issue of the Final Report, Mr. F. J. Waller, C.I.E., who was deputed in his place on the Committee, has signed the Final Report as the representative of the Punjab Government.

## APPENDIX TO PART III.

*Vide NOTE (4) Pp. 18.*

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIES AND LABOUR.

PUBLIC WORKS BRANCH.

No. I.R.-18.

*Dated New Delhi, the 8th November 1934.*

FROM

E. M. JENKINS, Esq., I.C.S.,

*Deputy Secretary to the Government of India,*

To

The Secretary to the Government of Bombay/the Punjab

Public Works Department,

Irrigation Branch.

*Subject.—Apportionment of the waters of the Indus and its tributaries between the parties interested.*

SIR,

I am directed to refer to the report of the Indus Discharge Committee, 1929, on the subject mentioned above. The recommendations of the Committee which are summarised in this Department's letter No. I.R.-61, dated the 22nd of March 1929, were accepted by the Governments of Bombay and the Punjab and form the basis of the understanding now in force under which important fresh withdrawals—

(a) from the main Indus, and

(b) from the tributaries of the Indus (in excess of the limited supply allowed to the Punjab for the Haveli Project)

are not to be considered until 1939. It is unnecessary to discuss the Bhakra Dam project which has been dealt with separately.

2. The Government of India are reluctant to reopen the very difficult question of prescriptive rights within the period of ten years which the Committee considered necessary for the collection of adequate discharge data. The Governments of Bombay and the Punjab are, however, aware that the Khairpur and Bahawalpur Darbars are most anxious to obtain increased supplies, the former with a view to regular *rabi* irrigation and the latter in consequence of readjustments which have proved necessary in the irrigation from the canals taking off at Panjnad. The Khairpur demand, which is based partly on administrative grounds and partly on the assertion that no claim can lie against the State for a share in the cost of the Sukkur Barrage unless *rabi* water can be granted, is understood to be for an additional 2,000 cusecs in January, February, and March. The Bahawalpur Darbar are admittedly bound by the tripartite agreement of 1920 between themselves, the Bikaner Darbar, and the Government of the Punjab and their present request is that the terms of that agreement may be relaxed in order to ensure the success of the Panjnad Canal system, in which the Government of India are naturally interested. In connection with the requirements of Bahawalpur, the Government of the Punjab are now advised that the limited supply allowed in 1929 for the Haveli project would be insufficient to ensure the success of the project in existing agricultural conditions. They are therefore anxious to obtain an additional supply. The requirements of Bahawalpur and the Punjab taken together may, it is understood, be put at 1,934 cusecs for *rabi* and 4,500 cusecs for *kharif*. It is evident that additional withdrawals on the scale contemplated, whether in Sind or in the Punjab, could be authorised only as a result of an agreement between the parties concerned or of an expert finding, accepted by the Government of India, that such withdrawals could be permitted without real detriment to any of the parties.

3. The urgency of the matter arises mainly from the claims of the Khairpur and Bahawalpur States. Hitherto, the Governments of Bombay and the Punjab have afforded these States provisional supplies to the extent required. An arrangement of this kind is admittedly unsatisfactory—to the recipient of the water because uncertainty interferes with colonization and agricultural progress generally, and to the authority making the concession because a provisional supply continued over a series of years may in practice become impossible to discontinue. The Government of India understand that the Governments of Bombay and the Punjab are anxious to reach some final settlement with the two States, and they themselves have important financial interests in the Bahawalpur canals. If the settlement of 1929 is to be adhered to rigidly no permanent arrangement with the States will be possible, and incidentally no further progress can be made with the Haveli project in the Punjab. What is required is either an agreement between the parties concerned, or a definite decision based on expert advice, as to—

(a) the extent to which additional supplies are actually required, and

(b) the possibility of affording such supplies without real detriment to the other parties interested in the Indus and its tributaries.

4. The parties interested in the Indus and its tributaries are numerous. In addition to the Khairpur and Bahawalpur Darbars and the Governments of Bombay and the Punjab, the Bikaner Darbar are interested both in the Sutlej Valley project generally and in the tripartite agreement of 1920. The Government of the North West Frontier Province have also to be considered. A settlement by negotiation through the medium of correspondence would be exceedingly difficult, and the Government of India believe that the most expeditious method of reaching a decision will be to refer the whole question of the additional supplies to an expert committee. It is important that the difficulties which have arisen should be approached in a conciliatory spirit, the object being if possible to secure a settlement which will be acceptable to all parties and injurious to none. If the suggestion that an expert committee should be appointed is acceptable to the Governor in Council, I am to enquire whether the enclosed draft terms of reference will be suitable. It will be seen that in addition to the claims of Khairpur and Bahawalpur the question of additional supplies for the Haveli project has been included.

5. As regards the composition of the Committee, the Government of India have considered the possibility of constituting an entirely independent body before which the representatives of the Local Governments and Darbars interested would appear as witnesses. They believe, however, that a satisfactory settlement is more likely to be reached by a Committee consisting of one representative nominated by each of the Local Governments and Darbars, and two representatives (who would be irrigation engineers of standing, entirely unconnected with the Indus controversy) nominated by the Government of India. The representatives of the Local Governments and Darbars would then be in a position not only to present their respective cases, but to take part in the discussions. I am to enquire whether the Governor in Council agrees that the Committee should be constituted on these lines.

6. Although the Committee would not consist exclusively of members of the Central Board of Irrigation, I am to suggest that it should be treated for purposes of procedure, and for the allocation of expenditure, as a Sub-Committee of the Board.

The Secretary to the Board would act as Secretary to the Committee, and would collect the material required and convene the first meeting in communication with the officers nominated to serve as members. The Committee would endeavour to arrive at a unanimous decision on the points referred to it, and would report to the Government of India.

As regards the details of the Committee's procedure it is essential, if meetings are not to be prolonged unduly, that the material to be considered should be circulated as soon as possible. The Local Governments and Darbars are, it is believed, fully acquainted with the facts relevant to the proposed terms of reference. But it will be necessary for the Secretary to submit without delay to the two independent members the material required for a general appreciation of those facts, and it is possible that the two independent members may wish to meet before the Committee begins its work, and to call for further information. These preliminaries will necessarily take some time, and I am to suggest that the opportunity might be taken by the Local Governments and Darbars to prepare statements of their views on the terms of reference, which should be forwarded (with a sufficient number of spare copies) to the Secretary well in advance of the date fixed for the first meeting of the Committee. The Committee would meet at New Delhi, and it is anticipated that the first meeting might be held on four or five consecutive days. There would then, in all probability, be an interval for the collection of further information and the settlement of details, followed by a second and final meeting lasting also for four or five days. The procedure proposed is summarised in the rough programme attached, and the Government of India will be glad to know if the Governor in Council considers this to be suitable.

7. When a Sub-Committee of the Central Board of Irrigation is convened, the Local Government or Local Governments interested should, in accordance with paragraph 7 of this Department's letter No. I/39/45, dated the 19th. July 1926, pay the travelling allowance of the members, and other incidental expenses. In the present case the Government of India propose that each Local Government or Darbar interested should pay the travelling allowance of its own representative. The travelling allowance of the two members nominated by the Government of India and the incidental expenses (for example, the pay of a stenographer and clerk, and the travelling allowance of the Secretary) would be shared between the Local Governments and Darbars. Should the meetings of the Committee last for periods much in excess of the eight or ten days for which the programme allows, or should the preparation of the report present special difficulty, the Government of India would be obliged to consider the grant of suitable honoraria to the members nominated by them. The expenses are in any case not likely to be heavy, and I am to enquire whether the Governor in Council is prepared to meet a reasonable share in them. The Government of India consider that the Governments of Bombay and the Punjab might suitably contribute one-third of the total expenses each, the balance being contributed in equal shares by the other parties interested.

8. If the Committee is to complete its deliberations by the end of March next, very early action will be necessary, and I am to request that if there is no objection the Government of India

may be furnished as soon as possible with the views of the Local Government on the points discussed in this letter. To recapitulate, these are:—

- (a) the necessity for the appointment of an expert committee;
- (b) the suitability of the draft terms of reference;
- (c) the composition of the Committee;
- (d) the suitability of the procedure proposed; and
- (e) the allocation of the expenditure.

If it is agreed that a Committee should be appointed, I am to request that the name of the representative selected may be communicated to the Government of India. I am to add that copies of this letter are being forwarded to the Government of the North-West Frontier Province and to the Political Officers concerned, and that the views of the Government of the North-West Frontier Province and the Darbars will be communicated to the Government of <sup>Bombay</sup> the Punjab in due course.

I have the honour to be,  
SIR,  
Your most obedient servant,  
E. M. JENKINS,  
*Deputy Secretary to the Government of India.*

D. A. : Referred to.

*Draft Terms of Reference.*

To examine, and report to the Government of India upon, the following matters:—

I. The extent to which additional supplies of water are actually required for:—

- (a) the Khairpur State;
- (b) the Bahawalpur State;
- (c) the Haveli project.

II. The possibility of finding such supplies without detriment to the parties interested in the waters of the Indus and its tributaries, and the effect upon the existing or prospective rights of those parties of any fresh withdrawals the authorization of which the Committee may recommend.

*Programme.*

*Stage of proceedings.*

*Approximate date by which to be completed.*

(1) Supply of material by Secretary to two members nominated by Government of India .. .. .. ..	As soon as possible, but not later than 15th. December 1934.
(2) Preliminary meeting (if necessary) of two members nominated by Government of India, and requisition for any further information required .. .. .. ..	15th. January 1935.
(3) Circulation of statements by Local Governments and Darbars (through Secretary) .. .. .. ..	15th. February 1935.
(4) First meeting of Committee (four or five days) .. .. .. ..	First week in March 1935.
(5) Second and final meeting of Committee (four or five days) .. .. .. ..	Last week in March 1935.

**PART IV.**

**BRIEFS OF THE INTERESTED PARTIES.**



## BRIEF OF BOMBAY (SIND).

1. The decision arrived at in 1929 not to permit additional withdrawal from the Indus and its tributaries for 10 years was acquiesced in by the Bombay Government and this Government has not asked for any revision. It is, therefore, for other Governments affected thereby to prove a case for any modification of that decision.

2. If, however, further withdrawals from the Indus are to be authorized, the Government of Bombay reserves the right to put forward such new figures for the authorized withdrawals of Sind Canals as may be necessary.

### Revised Requirements at Sukkur.

3. The revised requirements of the Barrage Canals are given in Annexure A. These show that the ultimate demands are greater by a very small percentage in January, February and March, less in April and early May, more in the latter half of May ; less in June, July, August by small amounts and substantially less in September, but greater in October and November. Except in October and November the additional requirements are comparatively trivial. The revised requirements now put forward are due to greater accuracy of calculation made of the water required.

### Supplies available at Sukkur.

4. Information in regard to the behaviour of the river and the water supplies available is now to hand for the years 1930-34 in addition to the information put before the Indus Discharge Committee in 1929.

Annexure B shows the maximum, mean and minimum discharges of each month, and Annexure C shows days on which the available discharge at Sukkur was less than the authorized and required discharges.

### Rabi Supply for Khairpur State.

5. Government of Bombay considers that it is essential before an extra rabi discharge is sanctioned for Khairpur that the terms on which this rabi discharge is given shall be settled. These terms are given in Government of Bombay, Public Works Department, No. 3079/22-IV of 30th. August 1934 and are :—

- (1) that the minima discharges of the Indus at Sukkur to which Sind shall have a prescriptive right shall be those mentioned in Government of Bombay letter No. 6590/27-I. W. of 26th. June 1933 ;
- (2) that the Khairpur State shall also agree to pay an increased share of the cost of the Lloyd Barrage according to the formula already accepted by the Government of India in paragraph 7 of their despatch No. 23-P.W., dated the 16th. December 1920, to the Secretary of State i.e. that the cost of the Barrage proper shall be shared between the Khairpur Durbar and the Bombay Government, in the ratio of the ultimate anticipated area of Kharif *plus* Rabi cultivation in the State to the ultimate area of Kharif *plus* Rabi cultivation in the whole Barrage area.

6. The Government of Bombay considers that if a rabi supply is made available\* for the Khairpur State, the water supply to be allowed in each month shall be revised to the same scale as in force on the other Barrage Canals ; the object being to minimize the extent and possibility of waterlogging. This would have to be worked out in detail but the maximum Kharif discharge would amount probably to 2,500 cusecs.

### Discharges for British Sind.

7. The Government of Bombay is not prepared to agree to a reduction in the admissible discharges by increasing the estimated ultimate duty or by decreasing the estimated ultimate intensity of the Barrage Canals. The former are already high for Sind conditions and any reduction of anticipated intensity would affect the financial stability of the Barrage Scheme.

\*The present rate of water supply is 2.8 cusecs per thousand acres at outlet head in dry crop lands (i.e. all except rice canal areas) and this cannot be reduced and is believed to be less than elsewhere.

### Other Interested Parties.

8. In regard to withdrawals by the Punjab, Bahawalpur or the North-West Frontier Province. The Bombay Government is not prepared to agree to such additional withdrawals except :—

- (a) on the same conditions as No. 1 in the case of Khairpur, and
- (b) unless it can be shown that available supplies at Sukkur will not be so reduced as to make these required discharges unavailable or precarious.

### Leakage at Sukkur.

9. Experience having shown that at the critical period during the first fall of the river, the available discharge is about 3,000 cusecs less than the actual discharge in the river at Sukkur, this figure should be added to the authorized withdrawals in estimating the availability of the water supply. This difference can be somewhat reduced when the gates have been artificially staunched but as there are 66 gates of 60' span each this hand staunching takes some time and its effect may not be available when required.

### Sind Inundation Canals.

10. If additional withdrawals are demanded for the latter half of May and June, September and 1st.-15th. October, the Government of Bombay considers that it will be necessary to consider the effect of such withdrawals in relation to the inundation canals of Sind.

11. Investigations show that since 1912 there has been a trend towards a reduced period of high water without, however, affecting the height of the peak and that this effect was well defined before the opening of the Barrage Canals.

Any additional withdrawals in these months will tend to prolong the period of low water in May and June and shorten the period of high water in September-October.

There are three gauges in Sind to which groups of Canals can be referred—

- (a) the Sarhad gauge for the Upper Sind Canals ;
- (b) the Kotri gauge for the Canals taking off near Hyderabad ; and
- (c) the Aghimani gauge for the Karachi Canals.

The fair irrigation levels at these gauges for various critical periods are as follows :—

—	15th. May.	1st. June.	30th. June.	1st. Sep- tember.	15th. Sep- tember.	30th. Sep- tember.
Sarhad .. .. ..	5.0	7.0	11.0	11.0	9.0	7.0
Kotri .. .. ..	11.0	13.0	16.0	20.0	18.0	15.0
Aghimani .. .. ..	12.5	15.5	20.0	23.0	21.0	18.0

Any withdrawals which would tend to reduce these levels would be harmful to the interests of the inundation canals and would therefore be opposed by the Bombay Government.

W. L. C. TRENCH,  
Chief Engineer in Sind.

**Note.—**In the BRIEF as finally approved by the Government of Bombay the following alterations were made :—  
Para 6. For "a rabi supply is made available" read "an enhanced or extended rabi supply is authorized."  
Para 7. Omit last sentence.

## ANNEXURE B.

Statement showing maximum, minimum and monthly mean <sup>8.</sup>

Month.	1929-30.			1930-31.			Maximum	
	Maximum.	Mean.	Minimum.	Maximum.	Mean.	Minimum.		
August	O. ..	591,204	494,736	347,373	502,984	434,599	343,186	433,69 <sup>8</sup>
	E. ..	7,381	7,356	9,764	7,607	6,965	6,214	11,53 <sup>8</sup>
	T. ..	598,585	502,092	357,137	510,591	441,564	349,400	445,23 <sup>2</sup>
September	O. ..	701,685	354,768	131,375	373,514	209,607	104,684	374,19 <sup>5</sup>
	E. ..	7,624	5,673	3,896	8,131	6,038	3,921	9,25 <sup>0</sup>
	T. ..	709,309	360,441	135,271	381,645	215,645	108,605	383,44 <sup>4</sup>
October	O. ..	118,716	85,210	64,290	108,635	72,388	53,761	103,66 <sup>2</sup>
	E. ..	3,752	2,680	1,713	3,735	2,604	1,624	4,80 <sup>2</sup>
	T. ..	122,468	87,890	66,003	112,370	74,992	55,385	108,47 <sup>1</sup>
November	O. ..	63,321	50,696	41,952	54,535	47,735	39,325	62,61 <sup>1</sup>
	E. ..	1,662	1,178	930	1,675	1,744	1,234	2,53 <sup>7</sup>
	T. ..	64,983	51,874	42,882	56,210	49,479	40,559	65,15 <sup>8</sup>
December	O. ..	43,679	39,082	35,521	38,821	35,716	33,438	40,77 <sup>1</sup>
	E. ..	836	693	547	1,175	891	646	1,44 <sup>4</sup>
	T. ..	44,515	39,775	36,068	39,996	36,607	34,084	42,21 <sup>4</sup>
January	O. ..	54,594	39,283	33,619	33,231	30,791	28,747	54,12 <sup>0</sup>
	E. ..	1,120	618	486	635	586	532	1,49 <sup>7</sup>
	T. ..	55,714	39,901	34,105	33,866	31,377	29,279	55,61 <sup>1</sup>
February	O. ..	56,739	44,759	34,120	40,452	33,557	28,590	43,38 <sup>8</sup>
	E. ..	1,553	922	436	1,122	814	532	3,31 <sup>a</sup>
	T. ..	58,292	45,681	34,556	41,574	34,371	29,122	46,70 <sup>1</sup>
March	O. ..	85,215	61,398	33,470	42,196	32,623	27,550	65,32 <sup>1</sup>
	E. ..	756	1,160	436	1,154	779	538	1,53 <sup>8</sup>
	T. ..	85,971	62,558	33,906	43,350	33,402	28,088	66,85 <sup>6</sup>
April	O. ..	333,690	158,668	83,736	88,761	51,777	31,689	65,91 <sup>1</sup>
	E. ..	2,216	2,879	3,000	3,352	1,826	693	6,74 <sup>0</sup>
	T. ..	335,906	161,547	86,736	92,113	53,603	32,382	72,65 <sup>1</sup>
May	O. ..	284,000	199,467	154,210	193,957	115,747	77,798	88,62 <sup>1</sup>
	E. ..	6,740	5,342	4,152	8,032	5,118	3,639	8,00 <sup>1</sup>
	T. ..	290,740	204,809	158,362	201,989	120,865	81,437	96,62 <sup>1</sup>
June	O. ..	361,445	248,132	188,250	281,941	164,914	100,070	236,15 <sup>1</sup>
	E. ..	9,012	6,930	6,360	10,551	6,735	4,171	10,61 <sup>1</sup>
	T. ..	370,457	255,062	194,610	292,492	171,649	104,241	246,77 <sup>1</sup>
July	O. ..	657,101	523,693	381,894	446,606	305,054	195,513	467,70 <sup>1</sup>
	E. ..	9,658	10,537	9,013	11,535	10,129	6,715	13,23 <sup>8</sup>
	T. ..	666,759	534,230	390,907	458,141	315,183	202,228	480,93 <sup>8</sup>

O=Outfall.

E.=Eastern Nara old head.

discharges of the Indus at Sukkur from August 1929 to January 1935.

1931-32.			1932-33.			1933-34.			1934-35.		
1.	Mean.	Minimum.	Maximum.	Mean.	Minimum.	Maximum.	Mean.	Minimum.	Maximum.	Mean.	Minimum.
7	373,664 10,883 384,547	316,858 9,369 326,227	571,986 13,025 585,011	483,629 12,341 495,970	393,587 11,933 405,520	627,454	570,082	484,110	521,005	458,532	356,442
8	249,623 7,326 257,149	107,372 5,018 112,390	414,975 13,041 428,016	180,587 10,964 191,551	86,889 10,217 97,106	593,302	319,505	197,719	320,321	187,377	121,789
9	87,250 3,812 91,062	64,253 2,595 66,848	82,809 10,285 93,094	53,636 10,032 63,668	32,779 9,009 42,688	173,098	99,898	51,759	132,449	73,345	44,436
1	50,486 1,968 52,454	40,851 1,522 42,373	37,888 9,231 47,119	28,973 7,477 36,450	21,310 7,145 28,455	57,421	46,072	37,442	46,427	40,911	34,023
2	33,227 2,551 35,778	24,433 3,225 27,658	23,514 7,172 30,686	21,528 6,373 27,901	15,932 6,461 22,393	39,386	34,981	27,587	38,258	33,096	28,263
3	30,596 2,972 33,568	15,515 3,658 19,173	23,678 4,583 28,261	21,104 4,919 26,023	17,034 6,000 23,034	32,735	29,197	25,408	34,510	30,465	27,279
4	24,522 3,233 27,755	11,838 2,165 14,066	23,392 1,255 26,647	16,809 5,288 22,097	13,100 6,100 19,200	30,366	27,173	24,136			
5	36,358 1,870 38,228	21,683 3,105 24,788	42,534 1,150 43,684	23,010 3,709 26,719	12,835 6,400 19,235	30,295	25,925	22,114			
6	47,818 5,711 53,529	32,039 4,400 36,439									
7	61,134 7,681 68,815	49,928 7,824 57,752	116,290	77,997	51,291	62,988	50,982	42,288			
8	176,133 9,770 185,903	101,800 8,825 110,625		380,824	229,968	138,540	351,424	178,930	50,505		
9	276,446 11,653 288,099	151,526 10,031 161,557			382,931	584,945	451,662	324,111			

T.=Total.

Old Head Eastern Nara banded up and new head working from 1st. April 1933

W. L. C. TRENCH

## ANNEXURE D.

*Statement showing gross*

	1	Lloyd Barr			
		Rohri Canal System.	Eastern Nara System.	N. W. Canal System.	R Ca Sys
Gross area commanded	..	Acres.	27,20,262	21,65,258	10,22,278
Culturable area commanded	..	,,	24,72,616	20,91,000	8,96,310
Area irrigable by complete project	,,		21,87,050	17,80,064	7,20,220

*(continued.)*

						Pinya Cana
						16
Gross area commanded	..	..	..	..	Acres.	1,91,0
Culturable area commanded..	..	..	..	..	,,	1,08,0
Area irrigable by complete project	..	..	..	..	,,	1,80,0

3 and culturable areas commanded by each canal system in Sind.

Large Canals.			Inundation Canals.								
Canal System.	Dadu Canal System.	Manchar Drainage System.	Desert Canal.	Uner Wah.	Begari Canal.	Canals in Rohri.	Sind Canal.	Rajib Chitti and Garang Canals.	Indus Canals, Right Bank.	Indus Canals, Left Bank.	
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
3,614	6,58,458	73,264	4,48,955	2,46,970	6,60,617	2,03,400	1,70,710	47,148	1,94,000	1,04,224	
5,007	4,83,700	37,218	4,48,955	2,03,244	5,65,246	1,75,975	1,45,715	28,260	65,206	72,794	
2,600	3,94,400	37,218	1,29,660	1,12,025	3,40,260	1,19,257	98,589	26,560	1,50,000	80,000	

Inundation Canals.

Canal.	Baghar Canal.	Sattah Canal.	Fuleli Canal.	Other Canals (Fuleli Division).	Mahi Wah.	Kalri Canal.	Hassanali Canal.
16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
100	1,12,057	36,971	15,71,537	1,63,644	2,00,251	63,707	98,905
185	99,603	21,793	11,91,056	90,087	1,52,431	63,707	74,390
100	90,000	30,000	4,00,000	30,000	1,06,873	39,413	19,000

W. L. C. TRENCH.

**PUNJAB GOVERNMENT BRIEF.**

No. 1398-NOR.

FROM

H. W. NICHOLSON, Esq., C.I.E.,

*Secretary to Government, Punjab,  
Public Works Department, Irrigation Branch,*

To

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,  
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIES AND LABOUR,  
PUBLIC WORKS BRANCH, NEW DELHI.

*Dated Lahore, the 30th. January, 1935.*

SUBJECT.—*Apportionment of the waters of the Indus and its tributaries between the parties concerned.*

**Irrigation.  
Works.**

SIR,

WITH reference to your letter No. I. R.-18, dated 8th. November, 1934, and in continuation of this office letter No. 10561-Nor., dated 6th. December, 1934, I have the honour to enclose for your information a Memorandum on the terms of reference of the Committee on the apportionment of the waters of the Indus and its tributaries. Spare copies of this Memorandum for use of the members of the Committee are being forwarded direct to the Secretary of the Committee together with copies of the following printed documents for use of the independent Members of the Committee appointed by the Government of India :—

1. Thal Major Project, 1924.
2. Thal Lesser Project, 1925.
3. Haveli Project, 1915.
4. Haveli Project, 1932.
5. Woolar Lake Barrage Scheme, 1915.
6. Report on Projected Bhakra Dam and other possible storage sites between the Rivers Jumna and Chenab, 1928.
7. Report of the Committee on the probable effect of the Bhakra Dam Scheme on the inundation canals of the Indus between Mithankot and Sukkur.
8. Sutlej Valley Project, 1920.

2. The Punjab Government representative will be instructed to place before the Committee the material on which the Punjab Government claims first, that the supplies asked for by them are available, and second, that the Punjab has a prior claim to supplies which are not required for the canals included in the Sukkur Barrage Project as sanctioned by the Secretary of State in 1923, which, for instance, did not include the rabi supply which it is understood it is proposed to give to Khairpur.

3. As regards the Punjab claims for water, the Punjab representative will probably be instructed to explain at the first meeting the nature of the variation in the demand for water that is experienced in arid climates such as the south-west Punjab as compared with the north-east Punjab where rain is comparatively common.

4. He will be instructed to place at the disposal of the Committee any data that may be required regarding the rise of the sub-soil water-table in irrigated tracts and the benefits obtained in the past by restricting rabi supplies in areas of high sub-soil water-table.

5. It is not at present possible to say in what respects it will be necessary to elucidate the Punjab irrigation practice for the benefit of those members of the Committee to whom the conditions of the Punjab are unfamiliar, but the representative will be instructed to give every assistance to the other members of the Committee to appreciate to the full the bearing of the arguments on which the Punjab base their claims to further withdrawals from the Indus and its tributaries.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient servant,

H. W. NICHOLSON,

*Secretary to Government, Punjab,  
Public Works Department, Irrigation Branch.*

Memorandum, dated 25th. January 1935, on the Terms of Reference for the Committee on apportioning the waters of the Indus and its tributaries.

**Haveli Project.**

The Haveli Project is designed to irrigate the land lying along the banks of the Chenab below the junction of the Chenab and the Jhelum. It will take up the inundation canal areas as well as the Sidhnai System. It originated from the fear that the opening of the Triple Canal System would adversely affect the inundation canals taking off the Chenab.

By the time the Haveli Project came into the field as a definite Project, the irrigation situation in the Punjab had become somewhat complex and now-a-days the canals are so inter-linked that there is scarcely a canal in the Punjab taking off the Indus and its tributaries that is not affected by the Haveli Project.

2. The Project submitted to the Government of India for sanction in 1915, which did not contemplate any perennial irrigation, was returned unsanctioned owing to the objection of Bahawalpur that the Project, if executed, would adversely affect the Bahawalpur Chenab Inundation Canals.

At that time, the Triple Canal Project was not functioning and it was assumed that there would be no Rabi supply available in the river at Trimmu when no water was passed below Rasul in the Rabi. It was anticipated that only kharif irrigation and rabi first waterings could be given in the Haveli Area.

The capacities of the proposed canals were :—

	Cusecs.						
Right Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,161
Left Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	5,386
						Total ..	6,547

3. When investigations in connection with the Sutlej Valley Project were commenced in 1919, it was found that in spite of the Jhelum being closed off at Rasul during the Rabi, there was a regeneration of supply at Haveli far in excess of anything anticipated. It appeared that an ensured mean Rabi supply in excess of 516 cusecs would be available at the Panjnad site from regeneration below Trimmu; which would enable the whole of the Rabi supply reaching Trimmu to be utilized in the Haveli Project up to the capacity of the canals proposed. At the same time, the construction of Panjnad Headworks ensured that the Bahawalpur Inundation Canals would not be adversely affected by any extra withdrawals for the Haveli.

4. In the 1920 Sutlej Valley Project Report on page xlviii, a note is given on the details of the Haveli Project as then envisaged and a statement of supplies passing Balloki given on page liii shows the benefit anticipated to the Triple Canals, and daily records for the last 12 years confirm the benefit which would accrue by utilizing water at Balloki for the Triple Canal Project. Not only could intensity of irrigation be increased in areas already colonized, but by utilizing the water made available in new areas of crown waste which exist on the Quintuple Canals, a credit can be obtained from the sales of land, in addition to water rates and land revenue which is fluctuating on these canals.

5. In order to ensure that the Haveli or other Projects would not be held up by any objection that they might affect supplies to the Bahawalpur Inundation Canals, the Punjab Government agreed to pay part of the cost of the Panjnad Headworks and has in fact paid 76 lakhs of rupees. These Headworks ensured to Bahawalpur the supplies allotted to and accepted by that State in the 1920 Sutlej Valley Project Agreement.

There is also a material benefit from the Haveli Scheme as regards water-logging in that a stretch of the Ravi, 240 miles in length, in which heavy losses of water occur at present, would remain dry for many months in the year so that the inflow into the sub-soil would be stopped; further owing to less supplies being

run in the Upper Chenab Canal to feed the Lower Bari Doab Canal when the latter was supplied from the Ravi there would be an amelioration of the water-logging conditions on the Upper Chenab Canal.

6. There is also another indirect benefit that in the early Kharif when the supplies for the Sutlej Valley Project are low the supply at Madhopur from the Ravi in excess of the requirements of the Upper Bari Doab Canal could easily be passed into the Beas for utilization in the Sutlej Valley Project. At present these supplies passing below Madhopur must be passed down to the Sidhnai and the greater part is lost in the dry river bed on the way.

7. When the financial aspect of the Haveli Project was under examination, it became obvious that the limitation of the Ravi withdrawals to a maximum of 1,250 cusecs was fatal to the success of the scheme.

8. It must be remembered that the larger portion of this area has already an established system of agriculture. Even in the area now dependent on the Sidhrai Canals the crops are largely assisted from wells except in a very good year when the canal gives an adequate supply throughout the year. These wells keep down any rise in the water table and to put them out of action would increase the danger of waterlogging. On the other hand the wells are not by themselves sufficient either to sow a large area in the Rabi or to mature a large area if sown. The prosperity of the tract is now dependent on canal supplies at the time of sowing and again on similar supplies at the time of maturing. The weakness of the tract arises from the fact that these supplies are not certain and vary greatly from year to year.

A statement is attached (Annexure A) showing the areas on the Haveli Project which was submitted to the Indus Discharge Committee in 1929 when the present restriction of Rabi supplies to a maximum of 1,250 cusecs was agreed to.

9. The 1932 Haveli Project was prepared to utilize the restricted Rabi supply, but it was found that the scheme would not be productive, since a supply of 1,250 cusecs would not ensure an adequate supply in October and November, and again during March, to enable a sufficient area to be sown and matured as would produce in land revenue and water rates a sufficient return to make the scheme remunerative. It is, however, possible to improve the financial aspect by a very small modification of supplies.

10. It is not proposed to alter the capacities of the perennial or non-perennial channels, which are based on the standard allowances of four cusecs per thousand acres gross for perennial channels at canal head, and six cusecs per thousand acres gross for non-perennial, giving capacities of 2,750 cusecs perennial and 5,000 cusecs non-perennial. All that it is proposed to ask for is, that if supplies are available in the river, the perennial canal of 2,750 cusecs capacity should be allowed to run full supply in the Rabi period up to 30th. November and again from 1st. March to 1st. April, the canal being run in the intervening period from 1st. December to 1st. March with a capacity factor of 0.3 giving a mean discharge during these three months of 825 cusecs.

The effect of this would be to increase the perennial area sown, but at the same time since there would be an intervening period during which the canal supply would be restricted, it would still be necessary to work the wells. These number very nearly 5,000 in the Sidhnai area alone and would continue to have a great effect on the water table.

11. The Punjab Government claim that the arbitrary restriction of the Rabi supply in the 1932 scheme, which it is understood, was the result of a misapprehension in the proceedings of the 1929 Indus Discharge Committee, should be removed and a supply given which in fact would not represent a greater supply than that furnished by the Sidhnai Canal in good years under existing conditions. The proposal is thus roughly in accordance with the existing agricultural practice of the tract.

The supply as claimed at present will give the most efficient use of the Rabi water and by ensuring that the wells remain in action, will avoid danger of water-logging.

### Thal Project.

12. The idea of irrigating the Doab lying between the Indus and the Jhelum is no new one. The first scheme for the irrigation of this Sind Sagar Doab or Thal as it is called was prepared in 1871.

A complete Project was prepared and submitted to the Government of India for sanction with No. 0995-W.I., dated 25th. September 1919, involving a Canal of 14,000 cusecs discharge utilizing a mean Rabi supply of 5,880 cusecs.

This was followed by the 1924 Project which involved a canal of 16,043 cusecs capacity and a mean Rabi supply of about 8,000 cusecs. An experimental canal project was then prepared to demonstrate the irrigability of the Thal but it was found to be unproductive. The Lesser Thal Project was submitted to the Government of India under No. 01237-N.I., dated 2nd. October 1925, with a head capacity of 6,750 cusecs and a mean rabi supply of just over 3,000 cusecs. This Lesser Project comprised the western portion of the Major Project, as a first step, as it was hoped the Major Project would ultimately be sanctioned.

13. There is, however, the Patti Project prepared by the Superintending Engineer in charge of the 1924 Project Surveys on his own initiative which was not put forward as it did not form an integral part of the Main Project but only contemplated irrigating the areas, which he considered were economically irrigable. Subsequent experience has confirmed the correctness of his appreciation of the fact that the greater part of the Thal is not economically or practically irrigable. The Patti Project is, therefore, accepted as being the best solution for irrigating the Thal. The Patti Project involves a canal of 6,000 cusecs head capacity and a mean rabi supply of 3,600 cusecs.

14. The Punjab, therefore, claim the right to a canal of 6,000 cusecs capacity with a rabi capacity factor of 0.6, the actual monthly capacity factor will vary in the same way as the capacity factor on the other perennial canals in the province where experience has shown the most economical way in which water can be used.

### Bhakra Dam Scheme.

15. The Bhakra Dam Storage Scheme contemplates impounding 5,750,000 ft. acres of water on the main Sutlej 40 miles above Rupar. The effect of this scheme on the inundation canals in Sind has been fully investigated and reported on by Messrs. Nicholson and Trench. This report has been accepted by the Governments of Bombay and Punjab and it is not, therefore, necessary to deal with this scheme in this Committee.

### Woolar Lake Scheme.

16. In addition to the Bhakra Dam there are certain other small storage projects which are possible on various affluents of the main rivers and one, the Woolar Lake Scheme, proposes to store water on the main Jhelum. The suggestion to impound water from the Jhelum in the Woolar Lake in Kashmir during August and September arose first in 1902 as a means of reclaiming swamps in the south of the Lake and for improving the navigation in the Jhelum River.

At this time, the Triple Canals Project was under discussion in the Punjab, and it was believed that a good deal of storage water would be required to meet the requirements of the new canals. The possibilities of the Woolar Lake Scheme were investigated by the Irrigation Branch in 1903 and it was concluded that the equivalent of 1,000 cusecs for 6 months could be stored at a cost of Rs. 49 lakhs and would give a return of 5.1 per cent. on the capital cost.

17. The discussions with the Durbar took a new turn with the proposals to dredge the outfall bar at Baramulla by electric power generated close by. At the same time, it was proposed that the State should construct the Barrage and get an annual contribution of Rs. 2 lakhs from the Punjab for the use of the water stored.

The Punjab did not accept the proposal as the charge was considered high and at that time (July 1905) it was considered that storage was not necessary for the Triple Canals.

18. The scheme, however, was not finally disposed of as the dredging of the Baramulla Outfall Channel had the effect of letting the water out of the Woolar Lake earlier than had been the case in 1905. By 1914, there was definite evidence that the dredging of the Bar had altered the flow of the Jhelum at Baramulla, causing a decrease of supply from October to December and an increase from January to March when compared with the flow of the pre-dredging period.

19. The 1915 Woolar Lake Project was prepared under the authority of the Government of India and provides for a storage capacity of 334,000 foot acres at an estimated cost of Rs. 14 lakhs.

The Project was prepared solely from the point of view of allowing a uniform supply to run for six months and no account was taken of the possibility of increasing the value of the water by supplying it at critical periods, or of holding up supplies when they were in excess during the winter.

The flexibility of control that would be given by such a barrage is great, and considering the small amount of water it is proposed to abstract in August and September to give the supply (about 6 per cent. of the total run-off of the Jhelum at Mangla during these months), the scheme is, therefore, included in the claims of the Punjab.

#### Other Storage Schemes.

20. A list of smaller storage schemes is given in Table 2 of the "Report of the Committee on the projected Bhakra Dam and other possible storage sites between the Rivers Jumna and Chenab". Certain of these sites have had observations made for the past 6 years which indicate that generally the annual run-off has been over-estimated. Nothing more has been done with regard to these storage sites on the affluents and there are no definite proposals in hand at present, to build any dams.

No general investigation has been done of storage sites in the Salt Range and the hills north of the Chenab, but these storages are of small capacity of much the same order as those mentioned in Table 2 of the Report.

#### Feeder Canals.

21. In addition to these storage works there are possibilities of constructing feeder canals, for example, the water which now passes Madhopur on the Ravi in the early kharif must at present be allowed to find its way 435 miles to the Sidhnai. Most of this water is wasted on the way and on the construction of the Haveli Project it would be possible to divert this water *via* the Upper Bari Doab Canal to the Beas for use in the Sutlej Valley Project. This is purely a matter of transferring water which at present never passes out of the Punjab.

22. On the other hand there are possibilities of constructing a feeder canal from the Chenab to transfer to the Beas early Kharif water which at present does pass Panjnad. The existence of such a feeder would, in addition to increasing supplies for the Sutlej Valley Project, also enable a canal to be constructed to irrigate the Jullundur Doab where the water-table has been falling for many years. Such a feeder from the Chenab to the Beas would enable water to be supplied in the months of April, May, and June to any extent that experience may prove it is possible to withdraw water from the Chenab during these months.







## BAHAWALPUR STATE BRIEF.

---

### Agreement of 1920.

The Sutlej Valley Project canals which have been constructed to irrigate Bahawalpur State territory may be divided into two categories, *viz.*, those taking off the Sutlej river at the Suleimanki and Islam Weirs, and those taking off the Panjnad river at Panjnad Weir. The supplies which can be drawn off by the canals taking off the Sutlej river are regulated by an agreement signed in 1920, before the Sutlej Valley Project was sanctioned, which gives Bahawalpur 57 and 42.2 per cent. of the supplies available during the rabi and kharif seasons, respectively. The corresponding figures for the British partner in this Agreement are 26.5 and 50.5 per cent. for rabi and kharif respectively and the Gang Canal, which feeds Bikaner State, receives the remainder.

2. These percentages were based on the gross area which, it was estimated, could be commanded by the various canals which were to be constructed by each partner.

This criterion could not be applied when fixing the supplies which could be drawn off by the canals taking off at Panjnad Weir. On the other hand it was considered necessary when the agreement was signed to limit these supplies, firstly in the interests of Sind, where the construction of the Sukkur Barrage canals was about to be undertaken and secondly in the interests of the Punjab, where the prospects of the proposed Haveli canal to take off the Chenab river above might be adversely affected if the Panjnad canals were allowed to acquire a prescriptive right to more than their fair share of water.

3. A clause 4. D. 2 was therefore inserted in the 1920 Agreement which limited the supplies which could be drawn for the perennial and non-perennial Bahawalpur canals taking off from the Panjnad river to a mean draw-off in each crop which should be maintained at the same fraction of their authorized maximum capacity in cusecs, as that of the British Sutlej Valley Project canals taking off the Sutlej river above.

4. This clause, if applied rigidly, would limit the supplies which could be drawn off by the Panjnad canals at many periods of the year when there is ample water available both for the requirements of Sind and the Haveli Project and a considerable quantity is passing unused to the sea.

### Subsequent Arrangement.

5. The Sutlej Valley Project Committee, Bahawalpur, therefore recommended in 1932 that the whole situation should be reviewed and a new arrangement come to, with the concurrence of the Governments of the Punjab and Bombay, which would enable the canals taking off at Panjnad to draw more reasonable supplies than those proposed under the 1920 Agreement.

6. As a result of this recommendation considerable correspondence has passed between the three Governments concerned and there have been informal discussions, but so many interests are involved that it has been impossible to come to any mutual agreement.

7. In the meantime the Governments of Bombay and the Punjab have permitted the Panjnad canals to draw water in excess of the amount permissible under the 1920 Agreement, since they realized that, if supplies were restricted to the extent proposed in that Agreement, this would greatly retard the development of the Panjnad canals, and further it seemed unnecessary to refuse water which could not be utilized elsewhere.

8. The Government of the Punjab have intimated, however, that they are not prepared to give unrestricted supplies after 31st. March 1935, lest Bahawalpur State should acquire a prescriptive right to water which might some day be required for the Haveli canal, if that canal is ever constructed.

9. It is very necessary therefore to come to some final agreement before that date, or the Panjnad canals may suffer severely because the supplies available in the Sutlej river at some of the most important periods of the year are often far

below those anticipated when the 1920 Agreement was signed and thus supplies in the Panjnad canal, if made to depend on the draw-off of the British S. V. P. canals would be restricted to an extent never contemplated when this Agreement was signed.

### Findings of 1929 Committee.

10. The question of further withdrawals from the Indus river and its tributaries was the subject of much discussion and controversy between the Governments of Bombay and the Punjab for many years; finally the recommendations of the Indus Discharge Committee 1929 were accepted by both Governments, and the Secretary of State ordered that the question was not to be reopened until 1939, by which time the effect of the draw-off by the new Sutlej Valley canals and the requirements of Sind would be more clearly known. Further, as a result of more accurate and continuous observations of discharges at various sites on the rivers over a period of more than 15 years, the supplies available would also be more definitely known.

### Extra Demands in Rabi.

11. Under one of the recommendations accepted in 1929 the Punjab Government have the right to draw off 1,250 cusecs during the Rabi season from 15th. October to 20th. April for the Haveli canal and a kharif supply of 7,500 cusecs during the remainder of the year.

12. It is understood that a remunerative project can not be prepared with such restricted rabi supplies, and that that Government are anxious to increase these to 2,600 cusecs, while leaving the kharif maximum permissible draw-off at 7,500 cusecs as at present.

13. Sind also is anxious for a right to draw off 2,000 cusecs during the rabi season to meet the demands of Khairpur State.

It is thus in the interests of all parties to reopen the whole question once more.

### Redistribution within the State.

14. It is now necessary to study how far the supplies of the Panjnad canals would be restricted if the present clause 4. D. 2 of the 1920 Agreement were enforced and to see the extent to which additional supplies are required, also how these can be found without unduly prejudicing the claims of the Punjab and Sind to the additional supplies required by them.

15. Two canals have been constructed taking off at Panjnad Weir *viz.* the Panjnad, a non-perennial canal designed to carry a maximum discharge of 9,567 cusecs for a gross commanded area of 14,55,500 acres, of which it was estimated that 10,18,850 acres or 70 per cent. would be irrigated annually. The second canal, the Abbasia, a perennial canal, was designed to carry a maximum discharge of 1,032 cusecs for a gross commanded area of 2,70,000 acres, of which it was estimated that 1,50,390 acres or 55.7 per cent. would be irrigated annually.

16. The Panjnad canal was intended primarily to take the place of a number of old inundation canals which used to draw water from the Panjnad and Indus rivers between the Panjnad Weir and the Sind border during the kharif season. The Abbasia canal on the other hand was constructed into new desert State waste lands with a view to developing new country.

17. Unfortunately it has been found that the area commanded by the Abbasia, is, for the most part, composed of soil of such quality that it can not be reclaimed economically, and it has been necessary to abandon this canal except for a very small area at the head which is given kharif water only and a further small area which can be commanded by one of the tail channels of the Panjnad canal.

18. On the other hand, a large area South-East of the Bahawalpur-Karachi railway line, which was designed to be irrigated by the Panjnad canal, is desert land and most of it State waste. There is much good land here, but it can not be developed with a non-perennial supply because almost everywhere the subsoil water is brackish, and the cultivators must depend on canal water for their drinking supplies and thus they can not settle down if the canals are to be closed for part

of the year. The Sutlej Valley Project Committee therefore recommended that this area should be given the perennial supplies intended for the abandoned Abbasia canal.

19. In order to conserve the Rabi supply and give more efficiently perennial irrigation to this area a new feeder channel has, as shown on the accompanying map (Annexure A) been constructed from the tail of Minchin Branch parallel to the railway line. This feeder will take up the distributaries at the tail of Rahimyar-khan Branch and feed the tail reach of Sadiq Branch in the Rabi season. Thus the whole Rabi supply will be passed into the Minchin Branch, which has been widened where necessary for this purpose.

20. The areas now commanded are as follows :—

Canal.	Perennial.		Non-perennial.		Total Culturable Area.	Remarks.
	Gross Area.	Culturable.	Gross Area.	Culturable.		
Panjnad ..	4,19,032	2,75,790	9,95,268	8,63,272	11,42,062	
Abbasia ..	..	..	20,725	18,987	18,989	It is proposed to irrigate a small N. P. area near the head which can not be commanded by the Panjnad Canal.
Total ..	4,19,032	2,75,790	10,15,993	8,85,261	11,61,051	

These figures are slightly different from those given in the Sutlej Valley Committee's report, page 32 : they are however the result of a more detailed investigation and the latest soil surveys. Also that Committee recommended that the rabi supply should be run down the Abbasia canal and taken across to the new area by means of an extension from the tail of that canal. It has been found cheaper, however, to run it down the Minchin Branch of the Panjnad canal, and close the Abbasia canal except for a small kharif supply given for a high lying non-perennial area near the head.

21. For these areas the combined canals may only draw off in any crop under the 1920 Agreement the same share of their full capacity as the British S. V. P. canals draw off from the Sutlej River above. As stated, the draw-off of these British canals is a fixed percentage of the supply available in the Sutlej which, omitting gains or losses in the river, may be taken as the discharge in the river at Ferozepur just above the Ferozepur Weir. In other words, the supplies which can be drawn off at Panjnad Weir under the agreement are normally a fixed percentage of discharge in the Sutlej river at Ferozepur excluding regeneration water or losses in the river between Ferozepur and Islam. The Chief Engineer, Punjab, in his endorsement No. 1678-S/Con., dated the 23rd. June 1933, copy attached (Annexure B), has thus fixed the permissible draw-off at Panjnad as 8 and 25 per cent. of the discharge of the Sutlej at Ferozepur during the rabi and kharif seasons respectively.

#### Supplies available in recent Years.

22. Annexures C and D show the average discharges over 10 day periods in the Sutlej river at Ferozepur during the past 5 years and the discharges which could have been drawn off by the Panjnad canals during the rabi and kharif seasons under the Agreement based on the percentages worked out by the Chief Engineer, Punjab. A glance at these will show how inadequate these supplies would have been in many periods, more particularly during the late rabi and early kharif seasons, when Sutlej river discharges are often far below those on which the Project was based. This is largely due to the fact that the estimate of available supplies was based on the average discharge in the river at Ferozepur for the years 1899 to 1920.

23. Unfortunately no allowance was made for additional supplies which might be drawn off by the Sirhind canal above. Actually that canal now draws off considerably more during March, April, May and June than it used to do previously, *vide* statement below, and this, coupled with decreased river discharges in the Beas river has led to a chronic shortage of water during certain seasons of the year in the Sutlej Valley canals. This shortage amounted almost to a water famine in April, May and part of June during 1932, and again, in 1934.

24. In addition to this there are heavy losses in the river during this period of the year between Ferozepur and Islam weirs of which no account was taken in the Project. The following tables show the position clearly :—

TABLE No. I.

*Draw-off of Sirhind Canal for the period 1909—1920 compared with the period 1920—1931.*

Year.		Average daily discharges of the Sirhind Canal.		
		March.	April.	May.
		Cusecs.	Cusecs.	Cusecs.
1909—1920	.. .. .. .. ..	3,826	3,895	4,117
1920—1931	.. .. .. .. ..	4,721	5,554	7,068
Average increased draw-off	..	895	1,659	2,951

TABLE No. II.

*Actual draw-off by S. V. P. Canals during the last 4 years compared with the average discharges assumed in the Project.*

Year.	April.			May.		
	Average discharge above Ferozepur Weir.	Average discharge received by all S.V.P. canals.	Loss in River.	Average discharge above Ferozepur Weir.	Average discharge received by all S.V.P. canals.	Loss in River.
Average discharge assumed in the Project .. ..	Cusecs.	Cusecs.	Cusecs.	Cusecs.	Cusecs.	Cusecs.
	9,524	9,524	Nil.	19,827*	15,227*	Nil.
Actual 1931 ..	7,960	7,101	861	10,018	9,005	1,013
,, 1932 ..	3,219	2,800	419	3,786	2,827	959
,, 1933 ..	7,581	7,206	375	11,005	8,763	2,242
,, 1934 ..	4,680	3,840	840	4,751	3,929	822
Average .. ..	5,860	5,237	623	7,390	6,131	1,259
Less than assumed in the Project ..	3,664 =38%	4,287 =45%	..	12,437 =63%	9,096 =59%	..

\* Note.—It was assumed that out of 19,827 cusecs available, 4,600 cusecs would be required for the Bhakra Dam canals leaving 15,227 cusecs for the S. V. P. canals.

#### Insufficient Supplies for S. V. P.

25. The Sutlej Valley canals taking off from the Sutlej River have a total capacity of 29,611 cusecs. A glance at the figures will show the alarming state of affairs. During the past four years the S. V. P. canals taking off the Sutlej River have drawn only 55 and 41 per cent. of the water assumed in the project during the months of April and May respectively, and in May 1932 the average discharge available was less than 10 per cent. of the capacity of the canals.

26. The development of cotton and sugarcane, probably the most important money crops in the year, has been sadly retarded, particularly on the non-perennial canals which must inevitably bear the brunt of the shortage.

### Unfairness of 1920 Agreement.

27. It would be grossly unfair therefore to limit the supplies for the Panjnad canals to the extent, which would be necessary if Clause 4-D (2) of the 1920 Agreement were rigidly applied. Indeed it is preposterous to tie the discharges which may be drawn off at Panjnad in any way to those available in the Sutlej river above.

28. If this view is accepted, it is necessary only to consider what supplies should be given at Panjnad to develop the area commanded efficiently without unfairly affecting the Sind canals or the prospects of future Punjab canals which may be constructed at any future date.

### Sind Requirements.

29. Sind is concerned during the rabi season only with supplies for the canals taking off at the Sukkur barrage. During the kharif season there is always ample water for the Sukkur canals, and thus only the inundation canals in Upper and Lower Sind need be considered.

30. Annexure E attached shows the average discharge over 10 day periods in the Indus at Sukkur from September until April for the past 13 years. It also shows the maximum requirement of the Sukkur canals during each of these months.

31. As will be seen in normal years there is a considerable volume of water over and above the maximum requirements of the Sukkur canals throughout the rabi season. During the past three years the discharge has sometimes fallen below these maximum requirements for some periods during February and March. It seems likely, however, that we are passing through a cycle of years with abnormally low rainfall in the Punjab hills and Kashmir, and consequently low river discharges. A similar cycle occurred at the beginning of the present century.

Be this as it may, the authorities in Sind are naturally anxious to protect the supplies to which they are entitled even during these years of depression.

### Sind and Rabi Supplies.

32. For this reason, pending the reopening of the whole question in 1939, Bahawalpur have only put forward a request so far for extra water during the Rabi season whenever the Sukkur Barrage is open, and water is being passed unused to the sea. Now, however, that the whole case is to be reviewed, it is suggested that the water available should be distributed more equitably according to the areas commanded by all the canals concerned.

33. As far as is known no canal in India receives its full maximum requirements all the year round, and excellent crops are reaped in Northern India without such supplies. The conditions on the Panjnad canal are in many respects identical with those in Sind, the average rainfall being only four to five inches a year. Thus in equity the Panjnad canals should receive the same volume of water per unit of area as that given to the country commanded by the Sukkur canals.

34. It must not be forgotten also that absorption losses will be very great during the Rabi season in the Panjnad canal and Minchin branch, since the water will have to be carried 55 miles before irrigation begins.

35. Also it is now beyond doubt that additional perennial supplies taken off at Panjnad would have practically no effect on the Sukkur canals. A study of the gauges and discharges at Bukkar will show how little these have been affected during the rabi season by the enormously increased draw-off by Punjab canals since the middle of the last century. It is an admitted fact that the greater is the draw-off the greater is the regeneration water in the river below. Thus, if the Panjnad perennial canal were allowed to draw off the extra 500 to 600 cusecs necessary for it to obtain its full supply of 1,032 cusecs, when available during the rabi season, the discharge at Sukkur would not be affected by anything approaching this amount.

36. In normal years there is spare water going waste to the sea throughout the rabi season, and so in such years the extra draw-off would in no way affect the Sukkur canals. On the other hand in years of low supplies, during periods when there would not be sufficient water for the maximum requirements of the Sukkur canals, there would generally not be sufficient water for the maximum requirements of the Panjnad and Haveli canals, as will be seen from Annexure F which gives the discharges of the river at Panjnad and at Trimmu (where the Haveli canal will take off) for the past 6 years.

37. Sind might well agree therefore to the Panjnad and Haveli perennial canals drawing off their maximum requirements respectively whenever this supply is required and available.

38. Even if this were agreed to, there would still be times during years of ample supply, when much water would be passed below the Sukkur Barrage unused to the sea. Now, if even one canal watering could be given between January and March to the crops on the non-perennial areas of the Panjnad canal, there would result a very great increase in the yield of Rabi crops in those areas. It seems wrong therefore that water, which could be usefully employed, should be allowed to run to waste.

39. It is, therefore, suggested that the Chief Engineer in Sind should inform the Chief Engineers of the Punjab and Bahawalpur by wire ahead stating the extra discharge, which might be drawn off during any coming period of 10 days after allowing for his requirements for the Sukkur canals. Arrangements could then be made between the Chief Engineers of the Punjab and Bahawalpur for sharing this extra water equitably as will be explained later.

### Sind and Kharif Supplies.

40. The supply of extra water during the kharif crop is a more difficult problem as far as Sind is concerned. As stated already there is always ample water for the Sukkur Barrage canals during this crop, and therefore the requirements of the inundation canals in Upper and Lower Sind only need be considered. These depend for their supplies on the level of the water surface in the river rather than on the actual volume passing, though of course, apart from any variations in river bed, the water level depends on the discharge.

41. The Indus is undoubtedly raising its bed, but the process is slow; on the other hand the increased draw-off at Sukkur has seriously affected the discharge and consequently the water levels below the Barrage during the early kharif season. Later when floods arrive the water levels rise in lower Sind to a higher level than formerly, because the old inundation canals which used to irrigate the country between Sukkur and Kotri have been closed and these were capable of drawing off far more than the Sukkur Barrage canals which now irrigate this area.

### Sind Inundation Canals.

42. The important period for all concerned, however, is the period from 20th April to 31st May. During this period a reduction of 1,000 cusecs in the discharge of the Indus at Kotri would probably make a difference of only about half an inch in the water level and a corresponding difference in the water level entering the inundation canals. These canals could thus only draw off a very small fraction of the 1,000 cusecs and the remainder must pass unused to the sea.

43. The question therefore arises how far it is justifiable to deprive a large area upstream, where the supply is controlled, for the sake of inundation canals lower down, which can only draw off a fraction of this supply, the major portion inevitably running to waste to the sea. This problem faces Sind as regards her own Barrage canals and it is one which must be faced now if the Panjnad canal is to be given any extra supplies.

### Expansion of Cotton Cultivation.

44. The prospects of the Panjnad canal largely depend on the cultivation of cotton, and this in turn will depend on the supply of water which the canal will

receive during the sowing period from 20th. April until 31st. May. The Panjnad canal was opened in 1932, and the area of cotton sown has risen as follows :—

								Acres.
1932	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	23,900
1933	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	48,824
1934	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	86,745

This increase is largely due to the fact that no restriction has been placed on the supplies which may be drawn off during May, and, provided reasonable supplies are permitted, the cotton area will continue to expand since the soil is admirable for cotton cultivation.

### Haveli Project Requirements.

45. It is difficult to make any suitable proposal for limiting supplies in the Panjnad canals as far as Sind is concerned, but the proposal made later to restrict supplies in the interests of the Haveli canal will also probably meet the situation as far as Sind is concerned, both now and after the Haveli canal has been constructed. For the present this would mean that the Panjnad canals would draw off not more than 49 per cent. of the discharge above the weir during the Kharif period. Annexure G shows that this would be limiting the Panjnad canal in years of low supplies to a far greater extent than the Sukkur Barrage canals, but at least in normal years it would get reasonable supplies for the cotton area.

46. The Government of Bombay have permitted the Panjnad non-perennial canal to remain open till the 31st. October for the last two years, on the understanding that it would not be opened until the 15th. April. This is a mutually satisfactory arrangement, and it makes possible the sowing of considerably greater areas of rabi crops on the non-perennial channels of the Panjnad canal.

47. It is suggested, therefore, that for the future the kharif period might be considered to extend from 15th. April to 31st. October instead of the present period, 1st. April to 15th. October.

48. If the Government of Bombay would concede these points it would then be necessary to see how far Panjnad canal supplies would have to be still further restricted to safeguard the interests of the proposed Haveli canal.

49. Annexure F shows the discharges for the past six years during the Rabi period at Trimmu, the proposed head of the Haveli canal, and at Panjnad. Also the amount of regeneration water by deducting the upper discharge from the lower. This of course does not take into account time lag. If these discharges are correct, there will be, except on rare occasions, ample water from regeneration to meet the needs of the Panjnad perennial canal during the rabi season.

50. On the other hand, if there is any lessening of this regeneration water due to any cause, the supplies at Panjnad might be unfairly affected at times if the Haveli canal were permitted to draw off all the water available at Trimmu throughout the rabi season. And further if the Government of Bombay are prepared to accept the proposal made above, that extra supplies may be drawn off for the non-perennial canals when the Sukkur Barrage is open and water is being passed unused to the sea, then any water available must be shared with the Haveli canal.

51. Such supplies should obviously be split up in proportion to the culturable area commanded by the Haveli and Panjnad canals. Unfortunately the Haveli canal is only in the project stage, and probably the exact culturable commanded area is unknown. In the project it has been assumed that 85% and 90% of gross commanded areas is culturable for the new and existing canal areas respectively. If soil surveys have been made, possibly a more accurate figure could now be given. If not, then the water available should be shared according to the gross commanded areas given in the table below until accurate figures for the culturable commanded area is known.

TABLE No. III.

Item.	Haveli project. Gross commanded area.	Panjnad Canal.		
		Gross commanded area of project estimato.	Actual area now.	
			Gross Commanded area.	Culturable area.
Perennial area ..	acres.	acres.	acres.	acres.
Perennial area ..	6,85,341	2,70,000	4,19,032	2,75,700
Non-perennial area ..	8,27,385	14,55,500	10,15,993	8,85,261
Total ..	15,12,726	17,25,500	14,35,025	11,61,051

52. Thus the Panjnad canal should get  $\frac{4,19,032}{11,04,373} = 38\%$  of the water available for the perennial canal during the rabi season and  $\frac{14,35,025}{29,47,751} = 49\%$  during the kharif season. Provided always that the Panjnad canals should be allowed to draw off at all times the full amount of the regeneration water between Trimmu and Panjnad, subject to any restrictions imposed by Sind as mentioned above.

53. It is understood that the Punjab Government are asking for 2,600 cusecs for the perennial area commanded by the Haveli canal, but, on the basis of gross areas commanded if Bahawalpur is to get 1,032 cusecs for 4,19,032 acres, the Punjab should only get 1,683 cusecs for 6,85,341 acres. Possibly however the percentage of culturable area is greater in the Haveli than the Panjnad area ; until however a final soil survey is made gross areas should be accepted as the basis of distribution.

54. Any extra water given during the rabi season for the non-perennial canals should be distributed in proportion to the area commanded by those canals, i.e. Panjnad 8,85,261 acres, Haveli 8,27,385 acres.

55. It is suggested that a simple convention might be agreed to, under which the Haveli canal would get all such water during the first half and the Panjnad during the second half of each month and *vice versa* in alternate years.

56. During the kharif season until the Haveli canal is built, or until the culturable commanded area is accurately known, the Panjnad canals might be permitted to draw off 49% of the water passing Panjnad.

#### State Canal Requirements.

57. Apart from cotton, which is a new importation, the Panjnad non-perennial area has always during the kharif season been a rice-growing country. This crop was encouraged by the large systems of inundation canals which previously poured vast quantities of water, most efficiently for this purpose, into this area during the flood season. In order therefore to meet the demand for water for the existing rice areas it has been necessary to run the canal almost up to full designed capacity during July, August and September although the gross commanded area on which the canal was designed has been reduced as shown in Table III above.

58. The maximum capacity for which the Panjnad canal has been constructed may therefore stand, but the maximum capacity of the Abbassia non-perennial canal may be reduced from 1,032 to 250 cusecs for the present. This may seem rather high, but there is a proposal to add some of the tail area of the Ahmedpur Branch of the Bahawal Canal, which has suffered severely owing to shortage of

Sutlej supplies, on to the Abbasia canal. Later the maximum capacity will be fixed when the exact area which can be commanded is known.

### Proposals.

59. To sum up therefore, the following are the proposals for a fresh agreement which it is suggested should govern the supplies which may be drawn off at Panjnad :—

- (a) The kharif season shall be considered to extend from the 16th. April to 31st. October each year, and the rabi season from 1st. November until 15th. April.
- (b) During the kharif season 49 per cent. of the discharge upstream of Panjnad Weir may be drawn off. The draw-off would be subject to a combined maximum discharge of 9,750 cusecs in the canals.
- (c) During the rabi season either (i) 38 per cent. of the discharge upstream of Panjnad Weir, or (ii) the difference between the discharge in the river at Trimmu and the discharge in the river above Panjnad Weir, whichever be greater on any day, may be drawn off, due allowance having been made for time lag. This draw-off would be subject to a maximum discharge of 1,032 cusecs in the canal.

NOTE.—Supplies would not necessarily be regulated under clauses (b) and (c) from day to day, but over considerable periods, an account being maintained and balancing periods fixed in agreement with the Punjab.

- (d) During the rabi season, of additional water, which may be available above Panjnad, and for the withdrawal of which the Chief Engineer in Sind may from time to time give permission, when the Sukkur Barrage would be open passing water unused to the sea, 50 per cent. may be drawn off. Thus, if the discharge in the river above Panjnad were 4,000 cusecs, and if the Chief Engineer in Sind gave permission for the withdrawal of the whole of this, then supplies, which might be drawn off at Panjnad would be 1,032 cusecs under proposal (c) above plus additional supply of  $\frac{50}{100} \{ 4,000 - (1,032 + X) \}$ , where X is the full rabi discharge of the Haveli canal. These supplies would be regulated as proposed in para. 54 or by means of a water account as found most suitable in consultation with the Punjab. The total draw-off under this proposal and proposal (c) above would be subject to a combined maximum discharge of 9,750 cusecs in the canals.

60. The percentages 49 and 38 mentioned above would be subject to revision when the exact culturable commanded area of the Haveli canal is known. Also when this canal has been constructed the actual culturable area commanded by the Panjnad and Haveli canals would be the basis for sharing the supplies available. The percentages would then apply to the discharge in the river above Panjnad plus the discharge drawn off by the Haveli.

### The Thal Project.

61. It may be argued that the proposals made above would prejudice adversely the prospects of the Thal Project should that ever be taken up once more. It would appear however from Annexure E which gives the discharges at Sukkur, that in dry years there is little hope of water being available during the rabi maturing period to meet the needs of such a large canal as that proposed for the Thal area, unless of course Sind is prepared to reduce the requirements of the Sukkur Barrage canals.

62. It would be better, therefore, to make a success of the Haveli and Panjnad canals rather than embark on what is generally considered a most doubtful canal scheme. If, however, it were decided to build at any future date, what must inevitably be at best, a semi-perennial canal for the Thal area, then of course there would seldom if ever be any water going to waste to the sea during the rabi season, which could be given as additional supplies to the Panjnad and Haveli canals under proposal (d) above, and the proposal is for the utilization of surplus water and does not, if accepted, constitute a claim on the additional supplies. It would meanwhile be very unfair to withhold this water indefinitely and let it to go to waste on account of the remote possibility of the construction of the Thal canal.

Sind to take Indus Supplies only.

63. Undoubtedly a very simple solution would be for the Bombay Government to drop all claim to Chenab and Panjnad water on condition that the Punjab dropped all claim to Indus water.

64. A study of the discharges at Panjnad will show that the extra water which could be drawn off under such an arrangement by the Haveli and Panjnad canals would not affect Sind to the extent, which might at first be supposed. During the last three years the total water available at Panjnad varied from about 1,800 to 4,000 cusecs over long periods from 1st November until the middle of March. Taking into account the draw-off already sanctioned for the Panjnad and Haveli canals, the proposals now made for additional supplies would, if accepted, have hardly any effect on supplies in Sind.

65. If this were agreed to, Sind could leave the Punjab and Bahawalpur Governments to settle their claims between themselves. They would only be left to meet any small claims which the North-West Frontier Province might make ; and these, it is believed, would hardly affect appreciably the discharges so far down the river in Sind.

66. This proposal therefore should be considered first : then, only if rejected by the Governments concerned, would it be necessary for Sind to consider any proposals concerning the division of the water available for the Panjnad and Haveli canals.


67. From what has been said above it will be seen that the Bahawalpur Durbar propose to share on an equitable basis whatever water can be made available between the Panjnad and Haveli canals. A reasonable time, however, should be fixed within which the Haveli canal should be constructed, because it is not fair that water should be reserved indefinitely for a project which may never be undertaken.

B. DARLEY,

*Chief Engineer,  
Bahawalpur Government.*

*Dated, 4th. January 1935.*





# MAP of BAHAWALPUR STATE

Scale 1 inch = 8 miles.


Miles 10

5

0

10

20





## ANNEXURE B.

COPY OF A LETTER FROM THE CHIEF ENGINEER, IRRIGATION WORKS, PUNJAB, S. V. P., TO THE  
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, 3RD BAHAWALPUR CIRCLE, BAHAWALPUR, NO. 1677-S./CON.,  
DATED THE 23RD. JUNE 1933.

## Panjab Canals Water Account

I have the honour to issue the following instructions regarding the distribution of supplies to the Panjnad Canals and the maintenance of the water account to obviate a certain indefiniteness which has characterized the keeping of this account during the Kharif sowing period now closed.

2. The distribution of supplies at Panjnad is governed by para. 4. D(2) of the Agreement between Bahawalpur, Bikaner and the Punjab, possibly modified by the second portion of para. 4E. Para. 4. D(2) fixes the limit which the Panjnad Canals may draw off as a proportion of the amounts which the draw-off of the British canals on the Gharra reach of the Sutlej bears to their authorized maximum capacities.

If  $X$  = actual draw-off of British Canals the amount which the Panjab Canals may draw off is—

(a) for Rabi X/3440  $\times$  1032 .. .. .. .. .. .. .. = .30X  
 (b) for Kharif X/20724  $\times$  10599 .. .. .. .. .. .. .. = .51X

The modification as per para. 4E would necessitate the keeping of a secondary water account for the period at the commencement of the Kharif and at its close when the supply in the river is below the share capacities of the non-perennial canals. The appropriate fraction would be

The keeping of a secondary water account is a refinement which the comparative small percentage differences would not appear to warrant so that for the present and without prejudice to any action which may be taken in the future it will suffice to keep a simple water account with the percentages.—

(a) Rabi .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .30X  
 (b) Kharif .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .51X

3. With regard to the method of distribution and balancing there are two possibilities—  
 (a) a day-to-day balancing based on the draw-offs of the previous day.  
 (b) A regular programme, which will ensure a definite supply, with the necessary concomitant balancing turns at stated intervals.

Method (a) is obviously an inferior one as with it the daily discharge will fluctuate and the officers responsible for the internal distribution will not be able to make satisfactory arrangements. Method (b) is superior but its use necessitates the indents in non-balancing periods being such that the operation of balancing can be carried out with the supplies available or likely to be available during the balancing period.

It is for the Chief Engineer, Bahawalpur State, to decide which method he prefers, but the arguments for (b) are so overwhelming that it may be assumed that he will choose this alternative.

It remains to fix the balancing periods and this is being discussed with Chief Engineer, Bahawalpur. For the present the balancing period of Kharif 1933 may be taken as from 6th. to 15th. October inclusive.

4. Executive Engineer, Panjab Division, should ordinarily accept and meet the indents for the Panjab Canals as framed by the indenting officers but he should warn the latter if their indents are likely to render balancing impossible and report the matter to Chief Engineer, Irrigation Works, Sutlej Valley Project direct.

5. The Water accounts for the Panjnad Canals should be submitted punctually at 10 day intervals by Executive Engineer, Panjnad Division, direct to the Chief Engineers, Punjab and Bahawalpur in the following form :—

Period.	Sum of British Canals on Gharrā.	Panjnad Canal Share.	Panjnad Canals Draw-off. Canal.			Excess or deficit.	
			Abbasia.	Panjnad.	Total.	In period.	Up to date.

Daily discharges are not required and the abstract of the 10 day period will suffice

The abstracts of the kharif sowing period 1933 should now be submitted on these lines.

ENDORSEMENT BY THE CHIEF ENGINEER, IRRIGATION WORKS, PUNJAB, NO. 1678-S./CON., DATED  
THE 23RD. JUNE 1933.

Copy forwarded to the Chief Engineer, Bahawalpur State, for information and favour of opinion on the following points :—

(a) The method of interpretation of the water account as outlined in para 2. This is distinctly favourable to the Bahawalpur partner during the early Kharif. It is suggested that the matter might be simplified further by working on the discharge of the river at Ferozepur instead of actual supplies taken by British Canals in the Gharra reach. The British shares of the river supplies are 26.5% during Rabi and 50.5% during Kharif, and Bahawalpur would be entitled to draw-off at Panjnad :—

During Rabi ..  $31 \times 26.5\%$  of supply at Ferozepur, say .08 of supply at Ferozepur.

During Kharif ..  $51 \times 50.5\%$  of supply at Ferozepur, say  $\frac{1}{2}$  of supply at Ferozepur.

(b) The maintenance of a regular distribution programme in preference to spasmodic day-to-day distribution.

(c) Assuming a regular distribution programme it is suggested that the following will be the most suitable balancing periods :—

(i) For Rabi Sowings .. .. .. 25th. December to 3rd. January.

(ii) For Rabi maturing .. .. .. 22nd. to 31st. March.

(iii) For Kharif Sowings .. .. .. 31st. May to 9th. June.

(iv) For Kharif maturing .. .. .. 6th. to 15th. October.

If after 9th. June in any year the river is insufficient to ensure full supplies to the British canals it will be necessary to resort to day-to-day balancing as a normal procedure. In years of exceptional water shortage in the Sutlej it might be necessary to postpone the balancing period if it appeared probable that day-to-day balancing would not yield the Panjnad Canals a minimum useful supply which may be taken as 2,500 cusecs.

## ANNEXURE F.

Statement showing the amount of water regenerated between the head of the small discharge

Month.	1928-29.			1929-30.			Trimm. Cusecs.
	Trimmu.	Panjnad.	Regenera- tion.	Trimmu.	Panjnad.	Regenera- tion.	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
October 16-20 ..	5,585	12,343	6,758	15,029	24,096	9,067	13,34
.. " 21-31 ..	3,632	9,716	6,084	10,931	19,557	8,626	13,12
November 1-10 ..	3,001	6,904	3,903	9,423	15,775	6,352	20,57
.. " 11-20 ..	2,332	5,754	3,422	6,074	12,621	6,547	6,12
.. " 21-30 ..	2,125	5,117	2,992	4,648	9,949	5,301	2,18
December 1-10 ..	14,423	9,579	*	2,943	7,081	4,138	1,95
.. " 11-20 ..	9,822	15,728	5,906	4,767	5,318	551	1,76
.. " 21-31 ..	4,289	8,996	4,707	4,030	7,968	3,938	1,58
January 1-10 ..	3,614	6,235	2,621	4,641	7,028	2,387	1,78
.. " 11-20 ..	2,540	6,037	3,497	11,844	9,769	*	2,30
.. " 21-31 ..	5,428	7,902	2,474	10,214	19,224	9,010	8,12
February 1-10 ..	10,111	13,721†	3,610	15,823	21,924	6,101	6,61
.. " 11-20 ..	8,119	11,808	3,689	8,021	15,860	7,839	3,38
.. " 21-28/29	4,794	8,121	3,327	6,163	7,866	1,703	3,01
March 1-10 ..	6,852	6,670	*	17,603	15,097	*	13,17
.. " 11-20 ..	10,552	9,908	*	28,696	26,260	*	11,00
.. " 21-31 ..	16,989	15,729	*	42,485	44,493	2,008	11,60
April 1-10 ..	15,562	20,154	4,592	55,418	56,667	1,249	21,12
.. " 11-20 ..	23,236	22,770	*	71,560	105,565	34,005	31,72

Remarks :-

\*When there is a sudden rise in the river at Trimmu, there is a lag at Panjnad. During all the periods

†Had the Haveli Canal been in operation and had it drawn off all the water passing Trimmu, is 1,032 Cusecs, and so the shortage, even in those periods would not have been marked.

3 Haveli Canals at Trimmu and Panjnad during the past 5 years. The figures include the  
ye received at Panjnad from the Sutlej.

1930-31.			1931-32.			1932-33.			1933-34.		
1.	Panjnad.	Regenera-tion.	Trimmu.	Panjnad.	Regenera-tion.	Trimmu.	Panjnad.	Regenera-tion.	Trimmu.	Panjnad.	Regenera-tion.
9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	
1.	Cusecs.	Cusecs.	Cusecs.	Cusecs.	Cusecs.	Cusecs.	Cusecs.	Cusecs.	Cusecs.	Cusecs.	Cusecs.
5	11,493	*	13,050	14,320	1,270	3,145	3,607	462	21,404	24,812	3,408
7	9,259	*	7,393	12,969	5,576	2,677	3,896	1,219	14,872	19,022	4,150
0	9,874	*	3,340	7,613	4,273	2,070	4,553	2,483	8,212	11,946	3,734
4	9,572	3,418	2,507	5,358	2,851	1,748	3,254	1,506	4,011	8,921	4,910
4	6,589	4,405	2,411	4,213	1,802	1,508	2,878	1,370	3,713	6,442	2,729
8	1,817	2,889	2,282	3,433	1,151	1,397	1,937	540	4,190	6,440	2,250
9	4,302	2,533	1,882	2,841	959	1,150	2,388	1,238	3,350	5,997	2,647
4	3,783	2,199	1,643	2,539	890	1,144	2,783	1,630	3,425	4,993	1,568
1	3,911	2,130	1,552	3,302	1,750	1,295	2,825	1,530	3,434	4,413	979
2	4,265	1,963	5,068	3,906	*	1,037	2,407	1,370	3,192	5,418	2,226
6	4,153	*	2,464	4,615	2,181	1,294	2,171	877	2,034	4,611	2,577
3	8,227	1,614	1,751	4,325	2,574	1,041	2,202	1,162	1,788	3,028	1,240
17	5,496	2,109	3,174	3,983	809	882	1,978	1,096	1,485	3,071	1,586
8	4,183	1,145	3,375	4,491	1,116	873	1,827	954	1,687	2,770	1,083
1	5,141	*	1,857	3,951	2,094	2,099	1,789	..	2,022	2,452	430
4	12,681	1,677	11,022	4,832	*	9,315	4,925	*	5,671	3,408	*
6	8,403	*	10,307	9,416	*	19,679	11,206	*	2,238	5,438	3,200
5	16,203	*	15,540	12,551	*	18,672	15,084	*	4,191	3,340	*
3	22,978	*	16,634	14,393	*	28,052	19,422	*	13,785	5,611	*

periods marked \* there would have been ample water for all canals.  
there would still have been ample water for the Abbasia Canal in all periods except those in italics. The Abbasia full supply

B. DARLEY,  
Chief Engineer, Bahawalpur Government.

## ANNEXURE G.

*Discharges of Panjnad River during early and late Kharif period during the past 4 years.*

Period.			1931.	1932.	1933.	1934.	Remarks.
April	1—10	..	16,208	12,722	15,244	3,340	
April	11—20	..	22,976	17,788	19,430	5,611	
April	21—30	..	31,460	17,038	22,990	13,939	
May	1—10	..	34,097	16,390	22,320	20,428	These figures for 1932-33 were taken from the Indus Bulletin from which a few days here and there were missing and the average of the remainder had to be taken. They are therefore subject to slight correction.
May	11—20	..	44,552	19,814	33,922	14,799	
May	21—30	..	41,863	18,289	36,911	12,946	
May	31—June 9	..	41,472	32,343	53,370	22,463	
September	21—30	..	51,665	15,138	105,180	24,182	
October	1—10	..	24,701	6,729	54,430	15,996	
October	11—20	..	17,329	1,860	23,420	9,168	
October	21—31	..	12,969	3,936	14,900	6,630	

B. DARLEY,

*Chief Engineer,  
Bahawalpur Government.*

NOTE.—Reference is invited to Appendix IV pp. 102 for revised figures supplied later by Mr. Gunn, Punjab



## BIKANER STATE BRIEF.

## Sanctity of Agreements.

1. An agreement when once signed must be executed. If in the course of execution it becomes evident that some of the clauses of the agreement are capable of improvement or bear unfairly on one or other of the parties to the agreement, then it is possible to re-examine the agreement and by mutual assent between the parties to adjust its defects. In agreements affecting more than two parties, it is not permissible for two of the parties mutually to adjust those portions of the agreement which they find inconvenient and ignore the claims of the remaining parties to a simultaneous amelioration of the defects which affect the latter. Nor is it permissible for two of the contracting parties to make a supplementary or subsequent agreement, any of the clauses of which override or negative any of the clauses of the original agreement. In other words an agreement is sacred until altered by the unanimous consent of all the contracting parties

2. The Sutlej Valley Agreement of the 4th. September 1920 is a tripartite agreement. The Bikaner Government hold that modifications of it should include the removal of defects experienced by any of the partners, and fear that without this comprehensive modification it will not be possible to obtain that mutual assent of the partners which is essential for the alteration of the Agreement.

## Rights of Usage of Water.

3. At this juncture it would be timely to state the position with regard to the uses of water for irrigation. By Indian practice non-riparian owners of land have exercised from time immemorial equal rights of irrigation with the riparian owners:—

- e.g. (a) The irrigation from hill streams is not confined to lands contiguous with the stream but is shared by all lands within a convenient distance.
- (b) The Shahpur private canals in the Punjab irrigate the lands of non-riparian owners and in some cases the canal is owned and controlled by an owner who has no river frontage.

That this practice was also extended to cover non-riparian States as distinct from individual owners is evident from the irrigation given by Moghal Rulers from the Western Jumna to the non-riparian States of Bikaner and Jind.

During recent times their British successors have continued the same practice:—

- (a) When the Western Jumna was re-opened in about 1825 a supply was given to the non-riparian States of Bikaner and Jind.
- (b) In 1865 the Government of India returned unsanctioned an early project for the Sirhind Canal, and issued orders for the preparation of a revised project. They directed that the only project they would entertain would be the best that could be devised irrespective of the territorial boundaries of British and Indian States.
- (c) In Despatch No. 76 of 30th. September 1870 the Secretary of State in sanctioning the Sirhind Canal project added—  
“The just and liberal view that you have taken with reference to the benefit to be derived from the Canal Works by Native States is undoubtedly correct in principle. The scheme will be the best that can be devised irrespective of territorial boundaries as was urged by the late Colonel Dyas.”
- (d) When the Sirsa Branch of the Western Jumna Canal was built in about 1895, a supply was given to the non-riparian State of Patiala.

5. It will be observed from these many instances extending over three-quarters of a century that it has been accepted as an axiom that waters made available for irrigation should be utilized in the best interests of the public irrespective of territorial boundaries, and irrespective also of whether the State owning the land to be irrigated did or did not possess a frontage on the river from which the supplies were drawn. The correctness of this practice is confirmed independently by modern American irrigational practice which endeavours, whether as between States or individuals, to secure the utilization of available water resources for the benefit of the largest number within the zone of economic command.

### Distribution of Sutlej Supplies.

6. At the Conference held at Delhi on 16th, 17th, and 18th October 1918 between the representatives of the Punjab, Bahawalpur and Bikaner to arrive at an agreement on the distribution of Sutlej supplies, the following basic principle which had been suggested by the Chairman, Sir Claude Hill, representing the Government of India, was accepted after amendment to incorporate the wishes of the Bahawalpur Representatives. The basic principle reads:—

“That in considering the method of disposing of the waters made available for irrigation by the Sutlej Valley Project, the general principle is recognised that these waters should be distributed in the best interests of the public at large, irrespective of Provincial or State boundaries, subject always to the proviso that established rights are fully safeguarded or compensated for, and that full and prior recognition is given to the claims of riparian owners, and that their rights in the existing supplies or in any supplies which may hereafter be made available in the Sutlej river below the junction of the Beas and Upper Sutlej are fully investigated and are limited only by the economic factor.”

7. Since the Sutlej Valley Project Agreement of 1920 is under review, the Bikaner State claims a re-distribution of the waters available on the Gharra reach of the Sutlej on two grounds:—

- (a) The areas suitable for irrigation and fit for cultivation (*i.e.*, Culturable Commanded Areas) bear no relation whatever to the Gross Areas on which the supplies in the river were shared. It follows from the principle of limitation by the economic factor that an acre of sand-hill perched 20 feet above the surrounding country side, or an acre of salt impregnated indurated clay on which no vegetation will grow, can have no title to water. Hence the only correct basis for sharing water must be the culturable commanded area.
- (b) If the present disproportionate shares of the river are allowed to remain, the supply allowed to the Bahawalpur partner is so generous relative to his Culturable Commanded Area that water will be used un-economically and wastefully, thus again infringing the principle of the economic factor.

8. The areas on the Sutlej Valley Project have been carefully surveyed as to command and qualities of soil, and it is now practicable to restate the basic principle more correctly in the following terms:—

“The waters made available for irrigation by the Sutlej Valley Project should be distributed in the best interests of the public at large, irrespective of Provincial or State Boundaries. All culturable commanded area within the perennial zones shall share the available supplies rateably during the Rabi. All culturable commanded area whether in the perennial or non-perennial zones shall share the available supplies during Kharif in amounts which are judged suitable for these two different classes of canal, but all culturable commanded area within one class will be treated uniformly.”

9. An agreement between parties whose claims are as conflicting and as hotly contested as were those of the Province of the Punjab and the States of Bahawalpur and Bikaner must always be in the nature of a compromise. While accepting this, it is desirable to bring on record that the Bikaner State desired to have the weir, corresponding to the present Ferozepur Weir, situated at Harike just below the confluence of the Sutlej and Beas. From a weir at this site it would have been possible to command the entire block of land in the State which lies North of the Ghaggar, and would have rendered unnecessary, as far as Bikaner is concerned, participation in another weir to utilize any water rendered available by the Bhakra Dam Storage Scheme. Also as the Ghaggar bed forms on the left bank the natural limit for irrigation, all Bikaner land commanded from Harike and lying North of the Ghaggar would have been entitled to contend on equal terms with similar areas belonging to the other parties for the waters of the Sutlej *cum* Beas available for distribution in 1920 and on which the present project is based. The Sutlej Valley Project is now a *fait accompli* as far as weir construction is concerned, but the effect of placing the weir at Ferozepore instead of at Harike has been to exclude very large areas of Bikaner land from laying claim to Sutlej Valley Project supplies.

### Limits of Irrigation.

10. With the uppermost weir at Ferozepur and with a weir constructed at Panjnad below the confluence of the Chenab and Sutlej, the area dependent on Sutlej water is that lying between the limits of command from these two weirs.

The irrigation boundary to the North is formed by the Sukh Beas a well defined drainage beyond which lie the lands already irrigated by the Upper and Lower Bari Doab Canals, and by the Sidhnai and Multan Inundation Canals.

To the South the irrigation boundary is the dry bed of the Ghaggar or Hakra, which now for obscure reasons is a poor non-perennial stream. South of the Ghaggar the land rises eventually to the low rolling hills of Rajputana and irrigation becomes physically impossible.

11. The area lying within the irrigation boundaries mentioned in the previous paragraph is divisible into 2 classes of land :—

(a) The low-lying or Khadir land adjacent to the river.

(b) The Bar or Higher Lands in the interior.

In the Khadir areas spring level is high, and, in consequence, owing to the dangers of water-logging, irrigation must be restricted.

In the Bar the sub-soil water level is found at great depths and these restrictions do not apply.

12. This natural division has forced the framers of the project to provide two classes of canals. The perennial canals flow all the year round for the Bar lands and the non-perennial canals flow from 1st. April to 15th. October when supplies permit for the Khadir areas.

At the time of preparation of the project the boundary between the Perennial and the Non-Perennial areas was fixed on the plans, and the areas thus fixed formed the basis of the 1920 agreement. It will be shown later how they have since been departed from in an unauthorized manner.

### Economic Interdependence of Partners and Canals.

13. The Khadir lands were for the most parts proprietary and had already been provided with a means of irrigation by inundation canals. These channels could only flow when the river levels permitted and the supply was subject to interruption for various reasons. They could not of themselves be improved by the provision of weirs as the cost would have been prohibitive. But they had established rights of usage of water in the kharif season.

14. On the other hand the perennial canals commanded large areas of crown waste which could be sold to defray the costs of construction and so were economically attractive. But before they could be constructed it was necessary to ensure that there should be no interference with the existing rights of the non-perennials. In short the perennial canals made financially possible the construction of the weirs which secured the established rights of the non-perennial areas and provided facilities for their improvement.

In the same way the interests of the three partners were interlocked and without the co-operation of all three, development would not have been possible.

### 1920 Agreement Provisions.

15. The agreement of 1920 provided for the irrigation of the following areas with the intensities shown against each :—

Partner.	Gross Area.	Intensity.	Proposed Annual Irrigation.
British Perennial	900,000	55.7	501,300
British Non-Perennial	2,880,846	50	1,440,423
Bahawalpur Perennial	1,730,000	62.6	1,082,980
Bahawalpur Non-Perennial	1,272,216	50	636,108
Bikaner	500,000	62.6	313,000

### Divergences from the Agreement.

16. Construction had not proceeded very far when it was found that the perennially commanded areas in Bahawalpur State were short of the areas claimed by the State and on which the Agreement of 1920 was based. In order to raise the revenue to that anticipated in the Project Estimate the area on the Eastern Sadiquia Perennial Canal was increased by the transfer of 103,915 acres from the Fordwah Non-Perennial Canal. This is a distinct breach of the Agreement, which stipulated the areas of each class of land and fixed the intensities for that class.

17. The Agreement further laid down :—

“The average perennial supply available will be allotted entirely to the perennial channels from 15th. October up to 31st. March and the non-perennial channels will be shut down on 15th. October.”

If therefore, as was the case, the limits of the non-perennial channels were defined, and it was agreed that those channels should be closed from 15th. October to 31st. March, then it is clear that the non-perennial areas were not intended to receive water between those dates. To transfer them, therefore, to a perennial canal is a breach of the Agreement. The Bikaner State urges that this land be returned to its proper class and that if as is believed to be the case the transfer of further large blocks of non-perennial land on the Sutlej to perennial canals is contemplated, such transfer should be stopped or if already carried out that the process be reversed.

18. Further it is a matter of common knowledge that large areas of the commanded land in Bahawalpur have proved quite unfit for cultivation and that in fact the channels on these lands have been abandoned. This was very frankly admitted by the Hon'ble the Finance Member for the Government of India in his speech of 29th. March 1934 in the Legislative Assembly. He there stated—

“The main cause of the loss of money in connection with this project is the fact that the Bahawalpur State, in order to secure to itself a large share of the waters of the Sutlej, and in order to prevent rivals—either another Indian State or the Punjab Government—from claiming a larger share of those waters, grossly overstated the area which was fit for irrigation and cultivation. They always maintained that they had an area fit for irrigation and cultivation of over two million acres. That was their statement and they refused to consider any plan which did not include the canalisation of the whole of that area and the allocation of water sufficient for that area. One of the reasons why the scheme has gone wrong is that it has now been established that not more than a maximum of about 900,000 acres is really fit for cultivation, and a great part even of that is of very doubtful value at the present level of prices.”

19. The Bikaner State has pointed out the deficiency of irrigable land in Bahawalpur on more occasions than one and now insists that the latest correct figures of culturable commanded area be placed before the Committee, and that on these areas the Agreement be revised.

In order to give the Committee some idea of the magnitude and importance of these issues the following figures are given. The Bikaner State understands that if unculturable lands are rejected and the non-perennial areas restored to their correct status, the areas which would be found to be entitled to perennial water during rabi are—

Punjab ..	..	..	..	..	..	800,000	acres.
Bahawalpur ..	..	..	..	..	..	900,000	acres.
Bikaner ..	..	..	..	..	..	650,000	acres
						2,350,000	acres.

20. Except for their own area Bikaner State cannot guarantee the accuracy of the figures but believes that they are a very close approximation to the truth. They may be compared with the 1920 figures:—

Punjab ..	..	..	..	..	..	900,000	acres.
Bahawalpur ..	..	..	..	..	..	1,730,000	acres.
Bikaner ..	..	..	..	..	..	500,000	acres.
						<u>3,130,000</u>	acres.

### Revised Requirements.

21. On these reduced figures accepting the project data of—

Rabi duty at distributary head ..	..	..	=210	acres per cusec.
Absorption Main Canal and Branches ..	..	..	=20	per cent.
Mean Rabi supply ..	..	..	=6,500	cusecs.

it would be possible to provide a rabi intensity of 48·4 per cent., say 48 per cent., on the culturable commanded areas actually available if the water were spread uniformly and so used with maximum efficiency.

Assuming a 48 per cent. rabi intensity, with a 210 acre duty, *plus* 20 per cent. absorption allowance, the mean discharges required for the canals would be—

Punjab (Pakpattan) ..	..	..	..	..	$1,829 + 366 = 2,195$	cusecs.
Bahawalpur ..	..	..	..	..	$2,057 + 411 = 2,468$	cusecs.
Bikaner ..	..	..	..	..	$1,486 + 297 = 1,783$	cusecs.
					<u><math>5,372 + 1,074 = 6,446</math></u>	cusecs.

The existing channels have been designed with maximum authorized supplies of 3,440, 7,416 and 2,144 respectively and are intended to run in rabi with a capacity factor of 0·5 and mean discharges of 1,720, 3,708 and 1,072 cusecs respectively.

22. In considering the re-organisation which is required in kharif the situation depends upon 4 factors:—

- (a) The shortage in perennial culturable commanded areas already mentioned.
- (b) A less pronounced shortage in non-perennial areas.
- (c) There is a decided shortage in available average supplies in kharif as compared with supplies anticipated in the project.
- (d) There are enormous fluctuations in the early kharif supply, some years being so very much below average as to demand special consideration.

23. As on the reduced culturable commanded areas actually available the rabi supplies, which approximate closely enough to the anticipated project supply of 6,500 cusecs, are sufficient to give a rabi intensity of 48 per cent., and as the early kharif supplies are admittedly short, it may be advisable to work to a smaller kharif-rabi ratio than the 1 to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  that was assumed in the project. If we assume a ratio of 1 to 2 then—

Kharif Intensity ..	..	..	..	..	..	=24% of C.C.A.
Rabi Intensity ..	..	..	..	..	..	=48% of C.A.A.
Annual Intensity ..	..	..	..	..	..	=72% of C.C.A.

The required Perennial Kharif Irrigation becomes—

Punjab ..	..	..	..	..	..	192,000	acres.
Bahawalpur ..	..	..	..	..	..	216,000	acres.
Bikaner ..	..	..	..	..	..	156,000	acres.
						<u>564,000</u>	acres.

24. If we retain the Project kharif full supply factor of 70, the discharge required for the perennial canals becomes—

Punjab ..	..	..	..	..	..	$2,746 + 549 = 3,295$	cusecs.
Bahawalpur ..	..	..	..	..	..	$3,086 + 617 = 3,703$	cusecs.
Bikaner ..	..	..	..	..	..	$2,229 + 446 = 2,675$	cusecs.
						<u><math>8,061 + 1,612 = 9,673</math></u>	cusecs.

The Project provided for the following non-perennial gross areas, giving to them an intensity of 50 per cent. with a crop ratio of 1 : 1—

Punjab ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2,880,846 acres.
Bahawalpur ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,272,216 acres.
Bikaner ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	<i>Nil.</i>
							<u>4,153,062 acre .</u>

25. In arriving at these areas the boundary lines between the Punjab and Bahawalpur Canals were taken at the centre of the river, thus including not only the river itself, but also the Sailab lands bordering on it, which being regularly inundated, it is not necessary to irrigate. The Sailab areas accounted to—

Punjab ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	219,434 acres.
Bahawalpur ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	195,582 acres.

When the 1926 Revised Project was being prepared these areas were excluded, but the shares of the river were retained and used to increase the intensities on the balance areas. This again is a breach of the Agreement.

26. Then there are on the non-perennials areas which have proved to be unirrigable whether on account of the quality of the soil or on account of the dangers of water-logging, which has already materialised and is likely to extend.

27. The Bikaner State would insist that the figures of culturable commanded area after excluding Sailab areas, and all bad land, and land already water-logged or liable to water-logging should be produced and should form the basis for a correct re-distribution of the waters of the river during kharif. If this is done the reduced areas of non-perennial culturable commanded land would approximately amount to—

Punjab ..	..	..	..	..	2,400,000 acres.
Bahawalpur ..	..	..	..	..	$\begin{cases} 900,000 \text{ acres.} \\ 100,000 \text{ acres reverted from perennial.} \end{cases}$

28. Now the 1920 Agreement and Project provided an intensity of 50 per cent. on the gross areas and a discharge at distributary head of 5 cusecs per  $\frac{1}{100}$  acres gross. The channels have been designed and built to give a supply of 6 cusecs per 1,000 acres C. C. A. at distributary head and this is certainly ample for the requirements even of non-perennial channels. Allowing these data to stand the discharge required for the non-perennial canals running at full supply becomes :—

Punjab ..	..	..	..	..	$14,400 + 2,880 = 17,280$ cusecs.
Bahawalpur ..	..	..	..	..	$6,000 + 1,200 = 7,200$ cusecs.

The share capacities up to which the perennials and non-perennials share equally are  $\frac{2}{3}$  of these figures—

Punjab ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	11,520 cusecs.
Bahawalpur ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4,800 cusecs.

The total draw-off from the river up to share capacity—

			Perennial.	Non-Perennial.	Total.
Punjab ..	..	..	..	3,295	11,520
Bahawalpur ..	..	..	..	3,703	4,800
Bikaner ..	..	..	..	$2,675$	..
				<u>9,673</u>	<u>16,320</u>
					<u><u>= 25,993</u></u>

29. If therefore the culturable commanded areas prove to be—

Punjab ..	..	..	..	$\begin{cases} \text{Perennial} \\ \text{Non-Perennial} \end{cases} =$	800,000 acres.
Bahawalpur ..	..	..	..	$\begin{cases} \text{Perennial} \\ \text{Non-Perennial} \end{cases} =$	2,400,000 acres.
Bikaner ..	..	..	..	$\begin{cases} \text{Perennial} \\ \text{Non-Perennial} \end{cases} =$	900,000 acres.
Bikaner ..	..	..	..	Perennial	1,000,000 acres.

the relative shares of the river, and the mean supplies required in the canals should be :—

Crop.	Partner.	Discharge Mean for Crop.	Share of River.	
Rabi..	Punjab .. .. .. .. .. ..	2,195	34	
	Bahawalpur .. .. .. .. .. ..	2,468	38	
	Bikaner .. .. .. .. .. ..	1,783	28	
Total ..		6,446	100	
Kharif	Punjab Perennial .. .. .. .. .. ..	3,295	12.7	
	Punjab Non-Perennial .. .. .. .. .. ..	11,520	44.3	
	Bahawalpur Perennial .. .. .. .. .. ..	3,703	14.2	
	Bahawalpur Non-Perennial .. .. .. .. .. ..	4,800	18.5	
	Bikaner .. .. .. .. .. ..	2,075	10.3	
	Total Perennial ..		9,673	37.2
	Total Non-Perennial ..		16,320	62.8
GRAND TOTAL (SILARE) ..		25,093	100	

The perennial canal head capacities per thousand acres culturable commanded areas are illuminating. Taking the existing capacities of the canals and the above culturable commanded areas, the capacities are :—

Punjab .. .. .. .. .. ..	4.30 cusecs.
Bahawalpur .. .. .. .. .. ..	8.24 cusecs.
Bikaner .. .. .. .. .. ..	3.30 cusecs.

#### Priority to Perennial Canals.

30. Now the average river supplies above Ferozepur in April, May and June are shown at page 73 and from these must be deducted absorption in the river between Ferozepur and Islam at say 20 per cent., to get the figure available for distribution :—

April .. .. .. .. .. ..	5,852
May .. .. .. .. .. ..	9,454
June .. .. .. .. .. ..	22,220

From these figures it is obvious that in average years, and even with the shares of each canal adjusted in accordance with the reduced areas, the canals can only expect to flow for a very short time during April and May.

But, there are large variations from the normal, particularly in May. In 1932 and 1934 for instance the supplies above Ferozepur did not exceed 5,000 cusecs until the beginning of June.

31. When such conditions occur, a very serious situation arises on the perennial canals which have no alternative source of supply even for drinking water. The non-perennial canals are in theory entitled to share equally with the perennials from 1st. April to 15th. October except when there is surplus water in the rivers when they may draw up to 50 per cent. in excess of their share capacity. Now the non-perennial areas are provided with wells and have a high spring level and can in consequence face shortages which would wreck a perennial canal colony. Also

perennial irrigation is more profitable to the State than non-perennial irrigation. Consequently the British and Bahawalpur partners, who alone have non-perennial canals, have in practice fed their perennials at the expense of their non-perennials, and have granted the Bikaner Canal an excess above its share when the river supplies are short. It would be as well to codify this practice.

Now though it is not an excessive amount as compared with other canal systems, where kharif supplies are more bountiful we may take  $\frac{1}{3}$  the distributary discharge *plus* half of the full absorption as minimum amount which will keep a perennial colony area in existence. This comes to—

Punjab	..	..	..	..	..	..	915 + 275 = 1,190
Bahawalpur	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,027 + 309 = 1,336
Bikaner	..	..	..	..	..	..	743 + 223 = 966
<hr/>							
2,685 + 807 = 3,492 cusecs.							

### Proposals.

32. It is urged that a solution of the difficulties will be that until the river supplies available for distribution exceed this figure the non-perennial canals will not open. Above this the non-perennials take all the discharges until they reach their equivalent supply of  $\frac{1}{3}$  distributary share capacity plus half absorption. After this the two classes of canal should share equally until full capacity of the perennials and share capacity of the non-perennials is reached. Then the non-perennials may draw off to their maximum capacity.

33. The net result of these proposals in kharif is best exhibited by the table below :—

Canal.	Month.	Mean Daily Supply.	
		As at present 44.2%	As proposed 37.2%
Perennial	April	2,587	3,492
	May	4,179	3,517
	June	9,821	8,206
	Total	16,587	15,275
Non-Perennial	April	3,265	2,360
	May	5,275	5,937
	June	12,399	13,954
	Total	20,939	22,251

That is, the perennials surrender an average daily supply of 146 cusecs during April, May and June of an average year and obtain a priority which will be of great advantage to them in lean years.

### Supplies available for Canals.

34. The supplies reaching Ferozepur and available for distribution after all the necessary adjustments for inevitable losses, absorption and regeneration are made, are shown in Annexures A, B, C and D. They are based on the average of 15 years ending 1934. From these it will be seen that the following supplies are available for the perennial canals, which under the present agreement are entitled to the whole supply from 16th. October to 31st. March and to  $\frac{13000}{29421}$  i.e., 44.2% of the supplies during the remainder of the year.

These amount to :

	Month.		Whole Supply.	Share of Perennials.	Share of Non-Perennials.
Kharif	April ..	..	5,852	2,587	3,265
	May ..	..	9,454	4,179	5,277
	June ..	..	22,220	9,281	12,300
	July to 25th. September ..	..	Full supplies available.		
	26.9—5.10 ..	..	26,520	11,722	14,708
	6.10—15.10 ..	..	19,435	8,590	10,845
Rabi ..	..	..	6,066	6,066	Nil.

35. The details of the perennial rabi supply are shown below for ready reference, the rabi period for perennials being assumed to commence on 1st. October :—

1.10—5.10 ..	..	..	..	..	$11722 \times 5 = 58610$
6.10—15.10 ..	..	..	..	..	$8590 \times 10 = 85900$
16.10—31.12 (Vide Annexure C)	..	..	..	..	= 550053
1.1—31.3 (Vide Annexure D)	..	..	..	..	= 518602
			Total ..	..	1213165

Mean Daily Supply Rabi .. .. .. .. 6671 cusecs.

36. During kharif the supplies which will be actually utilized are more difficult to forecast as even though ample supplies are available in the river it is not usual for canals to run to full capacity owing to lack of demand. In this we can only be guided by experience.

Annexure E gives for four important canals the monthly capacities utilized during the four years ending 1931-32.

The results are abstracted below :—

Canal.	April.	May.	June.	July.	August.	September
Lower Bari Doab ..	.47	.90	.91	.66	.80	.84
Lower Chenab ..	.77	.93	.88	.79	.86	.81
Lower Jhelum ..	.68	.71	.84	.60	.90	.80
Sirhind ..	.69	.83	.82	.55	.70	.79
Average ..	.65	.84	.86	.63	.82	.81
S. V. P. Perennials ..	.19	.30	.70	?	?	?

37. On the Sutlej Valley Project the paucity of supplies during the early kharif determines the low capacity factors in April, May and June. In consequence it is probable that a capacity factor of .8 will rule during July. It is likely that a capacity factor of .85 will be obtained in August and September, but conservatively a factor of .80 is assumed in the following calculations. The discharges utilized thus become on present distribution and capacities :—

April ..	..	..	2,587	Average actuals available in river.
May ..	..	..	4,179	
June ..	..	..	9,281	
July ..	..	..	10,400	Capacity factor of 0.80 on 13,000 cusecs,
August ..	..	..	10,400	
September ..	..	..	10,400	

cusecs.

which give an average daily supply of .. .. .. .. 7,938

Rabi actual supply for Perennials = .. .. .. .. 6,671

Kharif actual supply for Perennials = .. .. .. .. 7,938

### Effect of Rainfall on Duties.

38. It has frequently been urged in the past that owing to the poor rainfall of the S. V. P. perennials the duties to be adopted will be less than on other Punjab Canals. Annexure F shows the rainfall experienced on the S. V. P. perennial areas during the four years ending 1931-32.

The averages are abstracted below :—

							Inches.
Pakpattan ..	Punjab ..	..	..	..	..	..	9.07
E. Sadiquia ..	Bahawalpur ..	..	..	..	..	..	9.24
Bahawal ..	Bahawalpur ..	..	..	..	..	..	6.55
Gang ..	Bikaner ..	..	..	..	..	..	9.77

It should be recollected that approximately 7/9 of the Bahawalpur perennial area is on the E. Sadiquia and lies in the 9" to 10" zone of rainfall.

39. Accordingly statistics of irrigation in tracts lying around these limits of rainfall for the four years ending 1931-32 were examined. They are tabulated in Annexure G. Examination of the figures will show that there is certainly no obvious relationship between the rainfall for any particular tract and the duties whether in kharif or rabi, and that areas with much the same rainfall have widely differing duties. There is therefore no case for differentiating between different areas of the S. V. P. on account of variation in rainfall, though as the Bahawal Canal area is such a relatively small one and as this area is the only one where the rainfall differed markedly from the other tracts, any such differential treatment would not greatly affect the results.

### Absorption Allowances.

40. From time to time it has been stated that as the irrigation of the S. V. P. perennials is at a greater distance from the Headworks the absorption allowances should be increased. The correctness of this proposition is on the face of it untenable as the four weirs on the project were introduced largely to obviate this possibility. However the centres of irrigation of each system were approximately determined and the distance from the headworks scaled off with the following results :—

							Miles.
Lower Jhelum ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	75
Lower Bari Doab ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	68
Lower Chenab ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	90
Sirhind ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	87
E. Sadiquia ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	75
Bahawal ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	75
Pakpattan ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	88
Bikaner ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	105

It is clear that on the score of length no additional absorption is required than for any other canal system, except possibly on the Bikaner Canal.

The actual absorption in main canals and branches on most Canals runs at about 10% so that we shall be amply safe in assuming an absorption of 20% in the following calculations.

### Probable Irrigation with Supplies Available.

41. We may now consider the areas which can be cultivated on the supply available.

- (a) With the present distribution of river supplies,
- (b) With the distribution proposed in the preceding paras.

The irrigation duties from Annexure G are abstracted below by canals.

Canal.			Kharif Duty.	Rabi Duty.
Western Jumna Canal (Dry Tract)	..	..	157	213
Sirhind Canal	..	..	168	241
Lower Jhelum Canal	..	..	153	233
Lower Chenab Canal	..	..	132	256
Lower Bari Doab Canal	..	..	113	189

It will be seen that the Lower Bari Doab Canal has by far the lowest duties of the series. If then we base the expected irrigation of the S. V. P. perennial canals on the actuals of L. B. D. C. figures we shall have adopted the most conservative basis that can reasonably be expected. Now the table below shows the discharges utilized at Canal head of the L. B. D. C. and the irrigation obtained :—

Year.	Mean Supply.		Irrigation.	
	Kharif.	Rabi.	Kharif.	Rabi.
1928-29	5,197	3,003	5,66,000	6,90,858
1929-30	5,172	4,202	5,51,503	7,12,483
1930-31	5,205	3,891	5,42,248	6,06,128
1931-32	5,605	3,990	5,17,001	6,80,315
Mean	5,295	4,012	5,44,038	6,96,454

42. The mean S. V. P. perennial supply during kharif is 7,938 cusecs and if the S. V. P. perennials only work up to the relatively low standard of the L. B. D. C. the irrigation which will be obtained is

$$\frac{38}{6295} \times 544,938 \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad = 816,914 \text{ acres.}$$

The mean S. V. P. rabi supply is 6,671 cusecs so that S. V. P. rabi irrigation obtainable is

$$\frac{61}{4012} \times 696,454 \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad = 1,158,037 \text{ acres.}$$

43. The present shares of the partners in the river supplies (perennial canals) are 26.5, 57, 16.5 for the Punjab, Bahawalpur and Bikaner respectively. The averages obtainable work out as under :—

Partner.	Irrigation.			Actual C. C. A.	Actual Intensity.
	Rabi.	Kharif.	Total.		
Punjab ..	3,06,880	2,16,490	5,23,370	8,00,000	65
Bahawalpur ..	6,60,081	4,65,658	11,25,739	9,00,000	125
Bikaner ..	1,91,076	1,34,796	3,25,872	6,50,000	50

It will be seen that the Bahawalpur Partner is allowed under the present agreement a supply of water which, if utilized with the minimum efficiency of any of the Punjab perennial canals in dry tracts, will suffice to provide him with an intensity of 125 % on the actual culturable commanded area which he has and to which he is entitled. Such a high intensity is of course impracticable even with a very high class of cultivator, and if the present agreement shares are permitted to stand, the duties in Bahawalpur will never reach those which should be obtained, and the precious supplies of the Sutlej will be wasted.

41. We may now consider the irrigation with the distribution proposed in the preceding paragraph. The kharif supplies will be:—

Month.		Whole supply.	Share of Perennials.	Share of Non-Perennials.
April	..	..	5852	3492
May	..	..	9454	3517
June	..	..	22220	8266
July	..	..	..	8606
August	..	..	..	8606
September	..	..	..	8606
	Mean	..	..	<u>6904</u>
				<u>13661</u>

The total capacity of the perennials having been reduced a higher capacity factor during July, August and September is likely and .9 is used for the perennial and .80 as before for the non-perennial.

Kharif Supply Perennial .. 6904 cusecs

Kharif Irrigation Perennial ..  $\frac{6904}{5295} \times 544938 = 715,030$  acres.

i.e. the total kharif irrigation on the perennials would decrease but owing to the greater security of supply in April, May and June a greater proportion of the more valuable crops would be sown. Owing to the reduced capacity proposed for kharif (9,673 cusecs) the rabi supply is reduced by 98 cusecs to 6,671—98=6,573 cusecs. It is of course presumed that the channels will be remodelled to take the reduced kharif supply.

45. The rabi irrigation with 6573 cusecs would be

$\frac{6573}{4012} \times 696454 = 1,141,025$  acres.

Annual Irrigation .. = 1,856,055 acres.

Intensity  $\frac{1835808}{2350000} = 79\%$  (all partners).

46. As a further check on the adequacy of the proposals we may compare the distributary capacity allowance per  $^{\circ}/\text{oo}$  acres with that of other channels.

S. V. P.	..	..	..	$\frac{8061}{2350}$	..	3.43 (Now proposed).
Sirhind Canal	..	..	..	..	..	2.36
Lower Jhelum Canal	..	..	..	..	..	2.70
Hansi Branch, Western Jumna Canal	..	..	..	..	..	3.42
Sirsra Branch, Western Jumna Canal	..	..	..	..	..	2.27

Lower Bari Doab Canal—

(a) Montgomery	..	..	..	..	4.02
(b) Multan	..	..	..	..	4.51

Lower Chenab Canal—

(a) Rakh Branch	..	..	..	..	3.35
(b) Lower Gugera	..	..	..	..	3.73
(c) Burala Branch (P)	..	..	..	..	3.20
(d) Jhang Division	..	..	..	..	3.10

47. The water utilized at distributary head on these channels per thousand acres C. C. A. on the average of the 4 years ending 1931-32 is:—

				<i>Kharif.</i>	<i>Rabi.</i>	<i>Intensity.</i>
Sirhind Canal	..	..	..	1.75	1.38	63
Lower Jhelum Canal	..	..	..	2.01	1.95	71
Lower Bari Doab Canal	..	..	..	3.08	2.33	82.5
Western Jumna Canal—						
(a) Hansi Branch	..	..	..	2.16	1.38	62
(b) Sirsa Branch	..	..	..	1.36	0.93	40
Lower Chenab Canal—						
(a) Rakh Branch	..	..	..	2.87	2.59	109
(b) Lower Gugera Branch	..	..	..	1.05	2.76	110
(c) Burala Branch (P.)	..	..	..	2.74	2.12	100
(d) Jhang Division	..	..	..	2.67	2.23	86
S. V. P. Perennials (proposed)	..	..	..	2.40	2.33	78

#### Financial Implication of the Proposals.

48. Under the agreement the partners contribute towards the cost of the headworks in which they are interested in the ratio of the share capacities of their canals. One cusec non-perennial capacity is taken as equivalent to  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a cusec of perennial capacity. The cost of the Suleimanke and Islam headworks are approximately 200 lacs each and that of the Ferozepur headworks is 180 lacs.

The present approximate cost of the headworks to each partner is:—

Punjab .. (1) Ferozepur ..	71 % of 180=128 lacs.
(2) Suleimanke ..	39 % of 200= 78 lacs.
(3) Islam .. ..	37 % of 200= 74 lacs.
	Rs. 280 lacs.
Bahawalpur (1) Suleimanke ..	61 % of 200=122 lacs
(2) Islam .. ..	63 % of 200=126 lacs
	Rs. 248 lacs.
Bikaner .. (1) Ferozepur ..	29 % of 180= Rs. 52 lacs.

49. With a change in the maximum capacities of the canals there will of necessity be financial re-adjustment in the share of the cost of the headworks which each partner will pay. We may for the purpose of these calculations take the equivalent capacity of a perennial canal as twice the rabi mean supply as was

taken in the Agreement, the ratio of the value of 1 cusec non-perennial to 1 cusec perennial remaining at 3/4.

*Capacities.*

Partner.	Rabi Mean Supply.	Equivalent Rabi capacity.	N.P. Share Capacity.	Equivalent N. P. Capacity.	Total equivalent Capacity.	Share of cost in lacs.
<i>Ferozepur Weir.</i>						
Bikaner	.. .. ..	1783	3566	..	..	3566
Punjab	.. .. ..	..	..	6847	5135	5135
<i>Suleimanke and Islam Weirs.</i>						
Punjab	.. .. ..	2195	4390	4649	3487	7877
Bahawalpur	.. .. ..	2468	4936	4926	3695	8631

NOTE :—(1) N. P. Share capacity as per 1926 Project = 16421.

“ ” ” ” , present proposal = 16320.

This small difference is neglected in the present calculations.

(2) Rabi Equivalent Capacity =  $2 \times$  Rabi Mean Supply.

(3) Kharif , , , =  $\frac{3}{4} \times$  Kharif Share Capacity.

It will be observed that if Bahawalpur surrenders the excess share of water above its economic requirements its bill for the cost of the headworks will be reduced by 39 lacs of Rupees.

Further, the share of the annual cost of maintenance of the headworks is proportional to the share of the capital cost. Figures are not available of the shares of annual charges, but assuming as is probable that these charges would result in a saving on works and establishment of 1 lac to Bahawalpur, this sum capitalized at  $3\frac{1}{2}\%$  is equivalent to a capitalized saving of 29 lacs, making a total saving of 68 lacs.

50. If for any reason the Punjab partner does not wish to carry its share of the increase consequent on the reduction to Bahawalpur, the Bikaner Government is prepared to assume the full responsibility conditional on getting the increased share of water which the Punjab would otherwise obtain. It can easily make full use of this water in extensions of irrigation in the State.

*Summary of Conclusions.*

51. In conclusion Bikaner State urges that the sanctity of the present Agreement should be maintained. The Bikaner Government are prepared to assent to such modifications as may be found desirable provided that the waters available are re-distributed in the ratio of culturable commanded areas of all parties.

52. In order to remedy the difficulties experienced during early kharif owing to the available supplies being so short of project expectations, the State suggests that a small priority be given to the perennial channels, and if this is done it is prepared to consider a reduction of the kharif rabi ratio and a consequent diminution of the maximum capacities of the perennial canals.

DATED, SRI GANGANAGAR ;

*The 8th. February 1935.*

T. A. W. FOY, B.Sc., I.S.E.,

*Officer on Special Duty,*

*Irrigation Branch,*

*Bikaner State.*

## ANNEXURE A.

*Average discharges over 10 day periods of river Sutlej above Ferozpur Weir for the Years 1920—1934.*

## KHARIF SOWING PERIOD.

Year.	1st. April to 10th. April	11th. April to 20th. April	21st. April to 30th. April	1st. May to 10th. May	11th. May to 20th. May	21st. May to 30th. May	31st. May to 9th. June	10th. June to 19th. June	20th. June to 29th. June
Periods.	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX
1920 .. ..	7178	6849	8919	11040	9669	15785	20271	34926	43459
1921 .. ..	4520	5236	5357	6547	8974	19556	11553	9824	32877
1922 .. ..	8233	6978	8565	11474	15079	20520	16914	48639 (45000)	79524 (45000)
1923 .. ..	10385	10170	12912	15387	18139	15591	14119	23910	34462
1924 .. ..	6137	6597	6131	6074	5245	5684	8814	21553	56136 (45000)
1925 .. ..	4444	5137	11006	11840	7898	14248	45445 (45000)	28495	80381 (45000)
1926 .. ..	6719	6125	7304	8424	11630	21137	17548	18730	20987
1927 .. ..	5696	5540	5867	6628	6993	9896	15400	15008	14435
1928 .. ..	6412	9222	13838	11869	27148	27685	34356	51208 (45000)	40441
1929 .. ..	4974	4923	5842	7985	6886	7220	25046	44649	29464
1930 .. ..	9220	15652	15916	17721	29853	20446	28388	37095	41619
1931 .. ..	7523	6976	9699	10110	10883	9020	9027	14742	2650
1932 .. ..	3453	3218	3557	3480	3293	4437	9235	16175	19546
1933 .. ..	7807	7570	7346	8783	10718	12854	27352	33787	69788 (45000)
1934 .. ..	4183	5028	4832	4833	4411	4778	9016	21631	44619
Total ..	96884	105221	127091	142195	176819	208857	292039	401525	528609
Average ..	6459	7015	8472	9480	11788	13924	19469	27368	35240
Deduct Absorption at 20% ..	1292	1403	1694	1896	2358	2875	3894	5474	7048
Net Available ..	5167	5612	6778	7794	9430	11139	15573	21894	28192
Mean Monthly ..	5852			9454			22220		

## 1926 Revised Project :—

Capacity of Perennial Canals .. .. .. 13000 cusecs.

Capacity of Non-Perennial Canals .. .. .. 24632 "

37632 "

Absorption in River at 20 % .. .. .. 7526 "

Total Utilizable .. .. 45158 " say 45,000.

When river supplies exceed 45,000 cusecs, this figure is used for striking the average.

T. A. W. FOY.

## ANNEXURE B.

## Average discharges of river Sutlej above Ferozepur Weir.

## KHARIF MATURING PERIODS.

Year.	6th. September to 15th. September.	16th. September to 25th. September.	26th. September to 5th. October.	6th. October to 15th. October.	
Periods.	XVII	XVIII	XIX	XX	
1920	.. .. ..	29850	22565	13571	9288
1921	.. .. ..	74229 (38000)*	76931 (38000)	22749	13349
1922	.. .. ..	144986 (38000)	136398 (38000)	58775 (38000)	27486
1923	.. .. ..	44549 (38000)	24985	18148	13764
1924	.. .. ..	94470 (38000)	48794 (38000)	79448 (38000)	32865
1925	.. .. ..	33176	20972	14245	8139
1926	.. .. ..	94540 (38000)	31568	17597	13544
1927	.. .. ..	62384 (38000)	30567	19587	14788
1928	.. .. ..	46906 (38000)	25710	13977	8381
1929	.. .. ..	45035 (38000)	26246	18536	16380
1930	.. .. ..	47532 (38000)	35598	18028	11729
1931	.. .. ..	83675 (38000)	32228	27427	20612
1932	.. .. ..	60675 (38000)	30690	27977	13809
1933	.. .. ..	71571 (38000)	80427 (38000)	47233 (38000)	24724
1934	.. .. ..	33847	23568	17962	10163
Total	..	552873	456697	343804	239021
Average 15 years	..	36858	30446	22920	15935
Add Regeneration	..	3500	3600	3600	3500
Supplies Available	..	40358	34046	26520	19435

\*Capacity of Perennial Canals .. .. 13000 cusecs.  
Capacity of Non-Perennial Canals .. .. 24632 "

Total .. 37632 " say 38,000.

NOTE.—Figures in brackets represent maximum supplies in canals, where river supplies exceed these the maximum utilizable supplies are used for striking the averages as there is no absorption but regeneration in the river at the time of the year. This amounts to an average daily supply of 3550 cusecs over these periods.

T. A. W. FOY.

## ANNEXURE C.

Average discharges of river Sutlej above Ferozepur Weir.

## RABI SOWING PERIOD.

Year.	16th. October to 25th. October.	26th. October to 4th. November.	5th. November to 14th. November.	15th. November to 24th. November.	25th. November to 4th. December.	5th. December to 14th. December.	15th. December to 24th. December.	25th. December to 31st. December 7 days Period.	
Period	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	
1920-21	.. .. ..	6684	5996	5455	5043	4681	4310	3887	3810
1921-22	.. .. ..	13000	8790	7368	6380	5954	5704	5733	6160
1922-23	.. .. ..	11018	8822	6770	6329	6130	5293	5769	5298
1923-24	.. .. ..	7910	7261	6493	5646	5971	8899	6791	5219
1924-25	.. .. ..	13000	13000	10297	8448	7078	7756	7964	6180
1925-26	.. .. ..	7850	7275	9523	7400	6458	5384	5271	5021
1926-27	.. .. ..	10249	7165	6567	6390	5857	5454	5252	4870
1927-28	.. .. ..	10001	7017	6367	5886	5715	5593	5192	4472
1928-29	.. .. ..	7048	6164	5364	5430	5344	7215	5091	4758
1929-30	.. .. ..	9261	7113	6150	5686	5083	4964	9884	9819
1930-31	.. .. ..	8241	6317	5741	5280	4863	4725	4214	3057
1931-32	.. .. ..	13000	8456	6869	5411	5040	4420	4146	3890
1932-33	.. .. ..	9004	7325	6192	5612	5042	4865	4398	6051
1933-34	.. .. ..	13000	13000	9001	7322	6708	6170	5237	4391
1934-35	.. .. ..	6820	5459	4976	4567	4223	3925	4695	4731
Total	..	146036	119160	103133	90830	84147	84678	83524	77727
Average 15 years	..	9739	7944	6876	6055	5610	5645	5568	5182
Gain in River	.. ..	1406	1123	839	839	471	102	102	102
Total Availab'e	.. ..	11145	9067	7715	6894	6081	5747	5670	5284
Total available	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	560178	cusec days.	
Deduct unavoidable losses due to closure of Islam Weir	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	5000	cusec days.	
Net available	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	555178	cusec days.	
Mean Supply	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	.. .. .. .. ..	7210	cusecs.	

T. A. W. FOY.

N.B.—These figures have been corrected from Punjab records and differ from those in the original Bikaner BRITF.

## ANNEXURE D.

*Average discharges over 10 day periods of the river Sutlej at Ferozepur.  
ABOVE WEIR.*

Year.	January.			February.			March.		
	1st. to 10th.	11th. to 20th.	21st. to 31st.	1st. to 10th.	11th. to 20th.	21st. to 28th. or 29th.	1st. to 10th.	11th. to 20th.	21st. to 31st.
1920 .. ..	4970	4663	4261	5441	6947	5063	5219	6488	6491
1921 .. ..	4102	4222	5772	4706	4088	3769	3671	4198	3724
1922 .. ..	7687	6891	7280	9018	8609	9324	7377	6847	8290
1923 .. ..	4750	7997	8437	8450	11066	11889	7978	7640	9298
1924 .. ..	5114	8002	6351	6766	8633	6781	6524	6648	6603
1925 .. ..	6391	8918	8953	6101	4997	4700	4285	4029	4448
1926 .. ..	4495	4766	4306	4098	3733	3422	4054	11676	6635
1927 .. ..	4379	4241	3831	4036	4746	4756	4753	5156	5036
1928 .. ..	4856	4569	5282	7700	9003	7125	6620	6070	5517
1929 .. ..	5056	4161	4656	5321	5295	6079	4931	4906	5497
1930 .. ..	9820	10048	7569	9034	6912	6748	8944	8409	9243
1931 .. ..	3888	5780	5434	4402	4714	5496	9224	6378	6951
1932 .. ..	4076	4319	3746	4042	3325	3378	3121	3166	3151
1933 .. ..	4612	5843	5305	4275	4094	4770	7221	6598	8882
1934 .. ..	4456	9302	5645	4616	4856	4494	4206	4715	4073
1935 .. ..	4319	3812	7559	13000	7651	8973	..	..	..
Total ..	78752	93722	80788	88008	91018	97794	88128	92924	93837
Average 15 years ending 1934 ..	5243	6248	5786	5867	6068	5853	5875	6195	6256
Gain or Loss ..	+108	+108	+108	-35	-35	-35	-623	-623	-623
Net Available ..	5351	6356	5894	5832	6033	5818	5252	5572	5633

Total available all Partners .. .. .. .. .. 517301 cusecs days.  
Mean Daily Supply all Partners .. .. .. .. .. 5748 cusecs.  
Mean Perennial Supply Both Periods .. .. .. .. .. 6671 cusecs per day.

T. A. W. FOY.

N.B.—These figures have been corrected from Punjab records and differ from those in the original Bikaner BRIEF.

## ANNEXURE E.

*Kharif Capacity Factors on various Canals.*

Year.		April.	May.	June.	July.	August.	September.
<i>(a) Lower Bari Doab Canal.</i>							
1928-29	..	..	..	.42	.86	.91	.82
1929-30	..	..	..	.42	.90	.92	.58
1930-31	..	..	..	.51	.92	.88	.41
1931-32	..	..	..	.51	.90	.91	.81
Mean ..	..	..	..	.47	.90	.91	.66
<i>(b) Lower Chenab Canal.</i>							
1928-29	..	..	..	.86	.91	.92	.84
1929-30	..	..	..	.46	.94	.88	.77
1930-31	..	..	..	.83	.92	.86	.75
1931-32	..	..	..	.91	.93	.84	.71
Mean ..	..	..	..	.77	.93	.88	.77
<i>(c) Lower Jhelum Canal.</i>							
1928-29	..	..	..	.64	.67	.98	.57
1929-30	..	..	..		<i>Rejected owing to damage to Rasul Weir.</i>		
1930-31	..	..	..	.69	.63	.94	.58
1931-32	..	..	..	.70	.83	.61	.65
1932-33	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Mean ..	..	..	..	.68	.71	.84	.60
<i>(d) Sirhind Canal.</i>							
1928-29	..	..	..	.65	.80	.79	.71
1929-30	..	..	..	.66	.80	.81	.80
1930-31	..	..	..	.76	.89	.78	.49
1931-32	..	..	..	.68	.86	.89	.18
Mean ..	..	..	..	.69	.83	.82	.55

T. A. W. FOY.

## ANNEXURE F.

*Rainfall in Sutlej Valley Project Perennial Areas.*

Year,					E. Sadiqia.	Bahawal.	Pakpattan.	Bikaner.
1928-29	..	..	..	..	8.71	6.53	9.20	11.81
1929-30	..	..	..	..	6.35	6.64	7.54	5.18
1930-31	..	..	..	..	13.55	5.43	11.61	12.68
1931-32	..	..	..	..	8.33	7.58	7.87	9.42
1932-33	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6.52*
1933-34	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	10.13*
1934-35	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4.07†
Mean	..	..	..	..	9.24	6.55	9.07	9.77

\* Not taken when calculating Mean.

† Does not include January to March rainfall which on average amounts to 0.67 inches.

T. A. W. FOY.

## ANNEXURE G.

## Irrigation Data in Canal Irrigated Tracts.

CANAL.	Capacity per 0/00 acres C. C. A.	Year.	KHARIF		RABI	
			Duty.	Rainfall.	Duty.	Rainfall.
Hansi Branch of Western Jumna Canal.	3.42	1928-29	138	15.00	246	1.67
		1929-30	177	10.46	143	1.27
		1930-31	171	12.83	212	0.69
		1931-32	174	13.16	207	3.06
		Mean	165	12.86	202	1.67
Sirsa Branch of Western Jumna Canal.	2.27	1928-29	139	8.56	261	1.16
		1929-30	161	6.66	172	1.39
		1930-31	149	13.26	216	0.45
		1931-32	146	13.83	235	1.98
		Mean	149	10.58	221	1.25
Ludhiana Division of Sirhind Canal (Perennial).	2.36	1928-29	138	8.05	302	3.05
		1929-30	156	9.56	254	1.68
		1930-31	184	19.72	223	2.47
		1931-32	174	14.70	222	2.27
		Mean	163	13.01	250	2.37
Ferozepur Division, Abohar Branch of Sirhind Canal.	2.36	1928-29	162	7.67	264	0.58
		1929-30	163	6.61	238	1.35
		1930-31	178	10.19	255	1.19
		1931-32	182	14.12	260	1.85
		Mean	171	9.65	254	1.24
Bhatinda Division, Bhatinda Branch of Sirhind Canal.	2.36	1928-29	161	10.95	229	3.00
		1929-30	161	5.82	203	1.85
		1930-31	183	15.45	219	1.20
		1931-32	176	12.34	221	1.90
		Mean	170	11.14	218	1.99
Lower Bari Doab Canal, Montgomery District including Ballioki, Okhara and Montgomery Canal Divisions.	4.02	1928-29	126	9.35	209	1.16
		1929-30	120	8.15	204	0.95
		1930-31	123	11.42	213	2.03
		1931-32	111	13.01	199	1.13
		Mean	120	10.48	206	1.32
Lower Bari Doab Canal—Khanewal Division, Multan District.	4.15	1928-29	117	2.89	166	0.74
		1929-30	111	10.58	167	1.31
		1930-31	104	6.31	178	1.29
		1931-32	91	4.40	171	1.12
		Mean	106	6.04	171	1.12
Lower Jhelum Canal .. ..	2.70	1928-29	158	6.91	220	2.70
		1929-30	199	10.51	265	2.83
		1930-31	124	9.29	227	1.37
		1931-32	132	9.32	218	3.03
		Mean	153	9.01	233	2.41

(continued on page 80)

## ANNEXURE G.—(continued).

## Irrigation Data in Canal Irrigated Tracts—contd.

CANAL.	Capacity per 0/00 acres C. C. A.	Year.	KHARIF		RABI	
			Duty.	Rainfall.	Duty.	Rainfall.
Rakh Branch of Lower Chenab Canal.	3.35	1928-29	146	10.81	265	2.34
		1929-30	157	8.84	260	1.98
		1930-31	132	9.21	265	1.36
		1931-32	138	13.44	266	2.20
		Mean	143	10.58	264	1.97
Lower Gugera .. ..	3.73	1928-29	135	10.81	243	2.34
		1929-30	156	8.84	263	1.98
		1930-31	128	9.21	266	1.36
		1931-32	126	13.44	251	2.20
		Mean	136	10.58	256	1.97
Burala Branch .. ..	3.20	1928-29	119	10.81	248	2.34
		1929-30	137	8.84	249	1.99
		1930-31	126	9.21	310	1.36
		1931-32	146	13.44	243	2.20
		Mean	132	10.58	263	1.97
Jhang Division .. ..	3.10	1928-29	126	5.37	220	2.22
		1929-30	125	9.57	254	1.35
		1930-31	110	4.65	252	0.93
		1931-32	109	8.50	242	2.90
		Mean	118	7.02	242	1.85

T. A. W. FOY.

## KHAIRPUR STATE BRIEF.

1. The Khairpur State's case in brief is that it gave facilities for the Barrage project to the Bombay Government to its own great inconvenience. It agreed to participate in the project but it has not been allowed to participate equally.

2. Correspondence dating from the last century shows that Khairpur Darbar was opposed to the Barrage Scheme.

But as the Rohri Canal was an indispensable part of the Scheme, it was necessary for the Government of Bombay to get the Darbar's permission to construct the Canal through the State.

### Provision for State in Sukkur Barrage Projects.

3. Moreover, as the Khairpur State had prescriptive rights to draw water from the Indus and as the mouths of the two Main Canals were situated within a mile of the site of the present Barrage and as the whole existing system of State Canals was intercepted by the construction of the Rohri Canal, it was necessary for the Government of Bombay to make arrangements to give the State a new source of supply from above the Barrage.

4. Perennial supply was one of the inducements offered to the Ruler for joining the Scheme. In 1906, the Ruler said he was content with his existing irrigation system with wells for a cold weather supply and did not want a perennial supply, but when the Ruler finally agreed in 1909 to participate in the Scheme he did so on the understanding that the State would receive equal benefits from it with the rest of Sind.

### No Rabi Supply in 1919 Project.

5. In the 1910 Scheme a supply of 1,675 Cusecs in Rabi was given to the State, but in the 1919 Scheme the authors, presumably with the intention of using the rabi water, the most valuable product of the Scheme, in the most profitable way, retained the whole rabi water supply for British Sind and provided for the State a kharif supply only. It was argued that the Ruler had said in 1906 that he did not require a rabi supply, but no communication was made to the State that the rabi supply to the State had been omitted in the 1919 project. As soon as the Darbar came to know the details of the new Scheme, expostulations were made, but all protests have so far proved ineffective.

6. It is desirable at this point to stress the fact that had it not been for the loyal submission of the Ruler to the wishes of the British Government, it would have been impossible to carry out the Barrage project at all, for the Rohri Canal, which had to be aligned through the Khairpur State, was the main object of the Barrage.

7. Nor was the granting of facilities for carrying the Rohri Canal through the State by any means a matter of light consequence to the State. Some of the disadvantages to the State resulting therefrom may be described.

### Disadvantages to State of the Sukkur Barrage Project.

8. The construction of the Canal implied the compulsory acquisition of about 2,500 acres of land from Khairpur State land-holders, thus putting them to considerable loss and inconvenience and it caused a wide-spread disturbance of the State's irrigation system : the State has been divided into two parts by an obstacle absolutely impassable except by means of a few bridges : cultivators have been cut off from their fields and from their villages : many small patches of land have been isolated between the Rohri Canal and the railway so that it is practically impossible to cultivate them : and the considerable water-borne traffic that used to travel up the Abulwah, Mainwah and Mirwah to the Indus and on to Sukkur has been stopped.

9. Finally there is the seepage trouble, caused by the Rohri Canal, which is clearly a very serious matter.

At present about 20 to 30 square miles of country have been waterlogged, two large villages and about 10 small ones have entirely collapsed and have been abandoned and serious damage has been done to the State's capital town of Khairpur and to many other towns and villages.

In spite of the critical condition of the State's finances, of which Bombay Government are aware, no compensation has yet been received for damage done by the seepage.

### Project Provision Inadequate.

10. The irrigation supply given to the State by the 1919 Scheme is assumed by the authors of the Scheme to be sufficient to cultivate three lakhs of acres annually in kharif and a certain amount of bosi (unirrigated) crops in rabi.

11. Three lakhs of acres is about half the cultivable area of the State. Therefore the State at best is to be content with an intensity of (say) 60% made up of kharif crops and a few oil seeds while the adjoining Districts of British Sind are to have an intensity of cultivation of 81%, 27 in kharif and 54 in rabi. That is patently unfair treatment and a breach of the implicit condition on which the Darbar agreed to participate in the Barrage Scheme.

12. Not only is the assumed value of the Barrage supply allotted to the State quite inadequate, but also it will be shown that the actual value to the State is much less than that assumed by the authors of the Scheme.

13. The supply allotted consists of 4,000 cusecs during the months of June, July, August and September, 2,000 in April, 3,000 in May, and 3,000 from October to December 31st. It is not denied that an assured supply of this size adequately fulfils kharif requirements and is equivalent to the average pre-barrage abkalani supply of 4,500 cusecs.

14. The supply from October to December is useless for Rabi crops, and though it would enable some bosi crops to be grown where the soil is suitable it cannot be assessed as a valuable benefit.

### Full Supply Factor Unjustifiable.

15. The authors of the 1920 Scheme in assuming that the kharif supply of 4,000 cusecs would suffice for the cultivation of 3 lakhs of acres annually in kharif, have apparently further assumed that the Darbar would undertake a complete reconstruction of the canal system on modern lines; therefore they have assumed that the same Full Supply Factor as that adopted for normal parts of British Sind would be suitable for Khairpur State.

16. There are three reasons why these assumptions are unjustifiable.

The first is that the existing State canals are of an old-fashioned type with deep channels, in some places running along the old drainage lines. Though sufficiently effective they are economically inefficient.

To bring these canals and distributaries and water courses dependent on them up to modern standards of efficiency would entail an expensive remodelling scheme, but the cost of such a remodelling scheme, if added to the State's share in the cost of the Barrage, would be prohibitive.

17. The second reason is that the physical features of Khairpur State do not permit the same duty to be attained as in adjoining British territory and therefore a lower Full Supply Factor must be adopted, and the third is that an intensity of 50% in kharif with no rabi crops is agriculturally impossible. The soil in the State is mostly light and kharif crops in alternate years would rapidly exhaust it.

18. The State's new Barrage supply, therefore, amounts to little more than the replacement of its old pre-barrage inundation supply, which was admittedly a peculiarly regular one, and participation in the Barrage Scheme has brought to the State no appreciable advantage, but many obvious disadvantages.

### State's present requirements.

19. What the Darbar asks for now is a revision of the allotment of water, so that the State may obtain a supply sufficient for cultivation at an equal intensity to that fixed for British Sind.

20. The British Sind intensity is 81%; 27% in kharif and 54% in rabi. It is obvious that with only a kharif supply such an intensity would be impossible. Cultivation in both seasons must be done. In this connection another most important point must be made. Khairpur State is now surrounded by British Districts enjoying a perennial supply of irrigation water. If the State were not to get

a perennial supply, emigration from the State to the adjoining British Districts would immediately begin and in a short time the State would be denuded of cultivators. For this reason, therefore, a perennial supply is essential.

21. \*The State's cultivable area is 6 lakhs of acres, less 40,000 acres of shikargahs. 81% of 5,60,000 is 4½ lakhs and the State requires a water supply to enable it to cultivate approximately that area annually. According to the Full Supply Factor used in British territory 2,086 cusecs perennially would suffice. It will be shown, however, that it is not correct to apply to Khairpur State the same Full Supply Factor as that used in the adjoining British territory.

22. In the first place the irrigable area of the State has been bisected by the Rohri Canal; and the Eastern half, that commanded by the East Feeder (Mirwah), is in shape long and narrow: its length being over 70 miles from Begmanji to Kot Laloo in a straight line and its width varying from 5 to 15 miles and averaging about 8. Moreover ¼ of the Mirwah command is interspersed with uncultivable sand dunes and the soil in the cultivable area is mostly sandy and light. Therefore, losses by absorption and evaporation are much heavier than in the adjoining British territory and more frequent waterings are required to mature the crops.

23. In addition the Ruler has about 40,000 acres which are kept as shikargahs and these require watering both in kharif and rabi. The importance attached to the shikargahs by the Talpur Rulers is well-known and a provision of water for the shikargahs cannot be omitted.

For these reasons a Full Supply Factor for the State canals lower than that fixed for British territory is now demanded.

24. The figures suggested are 50 in kharif and 100 in rabi (against 72·5 and 145 in British territory) and these are the figures which were recommended by Dr. Summers in the 1910 Scheme. Based on this Full Supply Factor and on the same proportion of cultivation between kharif and rabi as is adopted in British Sind the State should receive a perennial supply of about 3,000 cusecs.

25. As has been shown this reduction in the Full Supply Factor is reasonable, and as an equal participant in the Barrage Scheme, the Darbar has a legitimate claim to a supply of 3,000 cusecs perennially.

26. Although, in return for all the facilities given, the Darbar might well have expected to receive specially favourable terms, no such demand is made. However, the Darbar is prepared to consider some readjustment in the proportions between kharif and rabi cultivation in the State and also a small decrease in the intensity of cultivation. The Darbar has shown its willingness to accept a full supply of 2,000 cusecs only in January, February and March and 4,500 only as a maximum in the kharif season. This will give an annual cultivation

Subsequently changed to:—

(a) 2·4

(b) 72

figure of 2,25,000 in kharif and 2(a)

lakhs in rabi, i.e., an intensity of 75(b)%.

It is believed that thereby the State

will not be at any appreciable disadvantage with British Sind.

### Supplies Available.

27. There is no shortage of supply of water in the Indus between May and December and by the 1919 Scheme the State receives adequate supplies in these months. The difficulty arises in giving the State a supply in January, February and March.

28. During these months no supply to the State has been provided in the Scheme and the Government of India do not permit the limit of withdrawals from the Indus laid down in the 1920 Scheme to be exceeded. Moreover it is doubtful whether the supply in the Indus will suffice for increased withdrawals.

### Proposals.

29. For the reasons given in paragraph 2 it is held that the Government of Bombay are under an obligation to allow the State to enjoy equally with British

\*Note.—After the Committee had met Mr. Sladen desired paragraph 21 to be corrected to read as follows:—

The State's cultivable area is 6 lakhs of acres, and 40,000 acres shikargahs, 81% of 6,40,000 is 5·2 lakhs and the State requires a water supply to enable it to cultivate approximately that area annually. According to the Full Supply Factor used in British territory 2,400 cusecs perennially would suffice. It will be shown, however, that it is not correct to apply to Khairpur State the same Full Supply Factor as that used in the adjoining British territory.

Sind the advantages of the Barrage, and that, therefore, they must supply rabi water to the State in January, February and March, even if it means reducing the rabi area in British Sind.

30. However, the Government of Bombay have suggested that the Government of India should permit an increase in the withdrawals from the Indus in these three months and that in case of shortage of supplies all canals should be reduced proportionately. The Khairpur Darbar are ready to accept this solution, in order that the Government of Bombay shall not be compelled to reduce the rabi area in British Sind.

31. In regard to further withdrawals in Bahawalpur or the Punjab in the rabi season the Darbar considers that the requirements of the Sukkur Barrage canals are paramount and must be supplied in full before any more withdrawals are allowed from higher up the river.

32. The withdrawals from the Indus in January, February and March shown in the 1920 Scheme were presumably limited by the supply of water believed to be available in the Indus during those months and not by any maximum laid down by the Government of India. If more water is found to be available, then the full Barrage demands deserve to be met first.

The question how much water may be considered to be normally available is one that the Darbar is content to leave to be decided by the Committee.

J. M. SLADEN,

*Minister,*

*Khairpur State.*

**PART V.**  
**INTERIM REPORT**  
with  
**TABLES.**

*Letter forwarding the Interim Report of the Committee on "Distribution of the Waters of the Indus and its Tributaries" to the Government of India.*

No. 2090-F. 47.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

CENTRAL BOARD OF IRRIGATION.

" CENTRAL TELEGRAPH BUILDING. "

*Simla H. O., the 20th. April 1935.*

FROM

F. ANDERSON, Esq., C.I.E., I.S.E., *Chairman,*  
*Committee on Distribution of Waters of Indus,*  
 and  
 F. A. BETTERTON, Esq., I.S.E., *Independent Member,*  
*Committee on Distribution of Waters of Indus.*

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,  
 DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIES AND LABOUR,  
 PUBLIC WORKS BRANCH,  
 NEW DELHI/SIMLA.

*Subject :—Committee on "Distribution of the Waters of the Indus and its Tributaries".*

SIR,

We have the honour to invite your attention to letter No. I.R.-18, dated 8th. November 1934 addressed to Secretary to the Government of United Provinces/ Bihar and Orissa, Public Works Department, Irrigation Branch, in which we were invited to act as Independent Members of a Committee on the subject cited.

2. It is understood that the recommendations of the Committee and the action to be taken thereon is of vital importance to some of the Governments concerned. We have decided therefore, with the concurrence of the Committee, to forward to you an **INTERIM REPORT**, which will indicate the general nature of the recommendations arrived at.

3. Certain of the agreements reached at the meetings of the Committee from 1st.—8th. March 1935, affecting the Punjab, Bahawalpur, and Bikaner have been found, upon detailed examination by these three Parties, to operate hardly upon one of them. These agreements have been modified at a subsequent meeting between representatives of the three Parties named, and the final recommendations in this **INTERIM REPORT**, have been made in accordance therewith.

4. All Members of the Committee, including the three mentioned above, have intimated their general concurrence with the matter of this **INTERIM REPORT**, with trifling modifications which will be dealt with in Part II of our final **REPORT** headed "Findings and Recommendations".

5. You will readily understand that the volume of this **INTERIM REPORT** has been reduced, as much as possible. We propose to submit the final report, complete with proceedings, as soon as this can be prepared.

We have the honour to be,  
 SIR,

Your most obedient servants,

F. ANDERSON,  
 Chairman.

F. A. BETTERTON,  
 Independent Member.

*Committee on Distribution of Waters of Indus.*

**INTERIM REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ASSEMBLED TO CONSIDER THE QUESTION OF THE "DISTRIBUTION OF THE WATERS OF THE INDUS AND ITS TRIBUTARIES".**

In their letter No. I.R.-18, dated the 8th November 1934, the Government of India proposed the formation of a Committee, to consider the question cited, and laid down the following terms of reference :—

I. The extent to which additional supplies of water are actually required for :—

- (a) the Khairpur State ;
- (b) the Bahawalpur State ;
- (c) the Haveli project.

II. The possibility of finding such supplies without detriment to the parties interested in the waters of the Indus and its tributaries, and the effect upon the existing or prospective rights of those parties of any fresh withdrawals the authorization of which the Committee may recommend.

2. The Committee assembled on the 1st of March, 1935.

The Committee consisted of—

Mr. F. ANDERSON, C.I.E., I.S.E.	..	Nominated by the Government of India.
Mr. F. A. BETTERTON, I.S.E.	..	Do.
Mr. W. L. C. TRENCH, I.S.E.	..	For Sind.
Mr. H. W. NICHOLSON, C.I.E., I.S.E.	..	For the Punjab.
Mr. A. ORAM, I.S.E.	..	For N.-W. F. P.
Sir BERNARD DARLEY, Kt., C.I.E	..	For Bahawalpur.
Mr. T. A. W. FOY, I.S.E.	..	For Bikaner.
Mr. J. M. SLADEN, I.C.S.	..	For Khairpur.
and		
Mr. A. M. R. MONTAGU, I.S.E.	..	Secretary, Central Board of Irrigation as Secretary to the Committee.

3. Prior to the meeting on the 1st of March, the two nominees of the Government of India framed a set of ISSUES. These ISSUES had been determined by the two INDEPENDENT MEMBERS as a result of their study of the BRIEFS, submitted by the INTERESTED PARTIES. During the meetings of the Committee, these ISSUES underwent slight modifications and their final form was as under :—

**Issues.**

1. *A principle.*

Should non-perennial irrigated areas receive perennial waters ?

2. *Project areas.*

The representatives of the INTERESTED PARTIES will please give the required information in the form attached.—

*Note.*—The representatives of the INTERESTED PARTIES should be in a position to justify their project intensities as they will be examined on these.

(For definition of "intensity" please see item No. 39 of Central Board of Irrigation Publication No. 5.)

3. *Duties.*—

The representatives of the INTERESTED PARTIES should be in a position to state their duties as these will be analysed in respect of quality of land, rainfall, method of cropping and subsoil water-table.

(For definition of "duty", please see item No. 56 of Central Board of Irrigation Publication No. 5.)

4. *A principle.*—

At this stage the members of the Committee will be called upon to express their views as to whether the available discharges should be divided on a basis of gross area or culturable irrigable area.

5. *Records.*—

What are the available river supplies at all the strategic points on the Indus and its tributaries between September and June ?

The Committee will also discuss the question of inundation canals in respect of the minimum levels required.

Regeneration also will be examined at this stage.

*6. A principle.—*

Should existing Canals take precedence over future Projects in considering the division of surplus waters found available ?

*7. Records.—*

The available river supplies for certain existing Canals, both perennial and non-perennial, are said to be inadequate at certain seasons. The Committee will examine this question together with that of the dates of opening and closing of non-perennial channels.

*8. With reference to the Haveli project, what are maximum and mean supplies required in (a) kharif and (b) rabi, and are these supplies available without affecting the efficiency of the existing canal systems ?*

*9. With reference to the Thal project, what are the maximum and mean supplies required in (a) kharif and (b) rabi, and are these supplies available without affecting the efficiency of the existing canal systems ?*

*10. Control.—*

The Committee may be asked to express their view as to the advisability of an independent "water control officer".

4. On the evidence put forward during the examination of these issues, the INDEPENDENT MEMBERS drew up points for discussion which were put forward as a circular dated the 5th. March. On the afternoon of the 6th. March, the INDEPENDENT MEMBERS withdrew and left the INTERESTED PARTIES to consider these POINTS FOR DISCUSSION.

5. The POINTS were as under :—

The INDEPENDENT MEMBERS of the Committee on the "Distribution of the Waters of the Indus and its Tributaries." offer the following suggestions as a basis for discussion by the representatives of the INTERESTED PARTIES.

From the hydro-graphs and other records examined, they are of opinion that the water supplies at the critical points are sufficient to justify them in putting forward the suggestions below as a reasonable basis for a solution of the problem.

In doing so the INDEPENDENT MEMBERS have confined themselves strictly to principles leaving details to be worked out after the representatives of INTERESTED PARTIES have recorded their views on them.

**Points for Discussion.**

*I. Khairpur.—*

The allotment of water for the irrigation of Khairpur State should be on precisely the same footing as that of British Sind, having due regard to the principles which exclude areas from irrigation, due to high water table or similar causes.

*II. Sind.—*

Sind to share the waters of the Indus with the Thal project when constructed.

(a) In this connection the INDEPENDENT MEMBERS are of opinion that the water supplies already guaranteed to Sind are unduly high, and will urge the necessity on several grounds of restricting water supplies to the minimum required for efficient irrigation. Nevertheless, it is not proposed to reduce the project intensity or the maximum authorized discharges.

(b) The change in the authorized share of Khairpur will result in a reduction of the water allotted to it in kharif together with an allotment of rabi water. The amount of the allotment of rabi water will be added to the total authorized withdrawal at Sukkur.

(c) Thal and Sukkur will share shortages in proportion to the head capacity or authorized full supply discharge.

### III. Bahawalpur at Panjnad.—

The INDEPENDENT MEMBERS are fully alive to the reasons which led to the restriction on the withdrawals from the Chenab of the Bahawalpur canals at Panjnad. The settlement proposed in its entirety, will remove the necessity for these restrictions. It is proposed, therefore, that the Bahawalpur canals at Panjnad and the Haveli project should share the available water strictly on a basis of their capacities or authorized full supply discharges. Hereafter the Bahawalpur canals at Panjnad will have no *claim* whatsoever on Sutlej water. Nevertheless, should surplus water pass below Islam, during a period when Haveli and Panjnad are below indent, then such supply will be taken into account when calculating the relative shares of Haveli and Panjnad.

### IV. Bahawalpur on the Gharra reach.—

It appears clear that the supplies available to Bahawalpur on the basis of the existing agreement are unduly large and it is proposed to re-allot the waters available in the Gharra reach. The new capacities might be fixed on a basis of the areas, as accepted during the meetings of this Committee.

### V. Kharif Period.—

It appears to be the general view of the Committee that the kharif period in the West Punjab and Sind is approximately fifteen days later than in the rest of the Punjab. It is proposed that for all purposes the kharif period should be fixed from the 15th. April to the 31st. October, and that changes in authorized shares should take place on these dates.

### 6. The Committee as a whole reassembled on the morning of the 8th. March.

The INDEPENDENT MEMBERS then took each proposal in turn and enquired if agreement had been reached by the INTERESTED PARTIES and if so, to state the terms of that agreement.

Where agreement had not been reached, the precise points still at issue, were recorded and the general opinion of the Committee was taken thereon. In consequence there is now no major point, upon which the Committee felt unable to frame a definite recommendation.

7. Dealing with each proposal in order, the following are the unanimous recommendations of the Committee :—

#### Recommendations.

##### *Proposal I.—*

The Committee generally accepted the proposal that the irrigation of Khairpur State should be brought on the same basis as that of the perennial channels of British Sind.

Assuming that the culturable commanded area is 640,000 acres including 40,000 acres of reserved forest as stated by Mr. Sladen (Khairpur State) and including the areas water-logged at the moment, as culturable, then on the basis of 4.2 cusecs at canal head per thousand acres of culturable commanded area, permissible head capacity would be 2,688 cusecs.

Mr. Sladen dissented. (See paras. 9 to 11).

8. An unsurveyed area of the State, which lies on the Eastern Nara Canals, has already been allotted a capacity of 400 cusecs on a non-perennial basis. Converting this to a perennial basis, the perennial capacity would be 267 cusecs.

In both the above calculations, no consideration has been given to rice areas. The change in the above figures to arrive at the final authorized capacity will be small and does not affect the conclusion.

9. Mr. Sladen's objection is summarized as follows :—

He was satisfied from what he had heard, that the most efficient method of using perennial water was to utilize the supply at the time when the crops normally required it, *viz.* at sowing and maturing times. On this account, he demanded that the 2,688 cusecs quoted above should be mean discharge and not maximum permissible.

10. Chairman remarked that Mr. Sladen's objections had been noted. He would point out that it was not proposed to reduce the total authorized withdrawals at Sukkur during kharif. On the other hand, the total authorized withdrawals at Sukkur were to be increased during part of the rabi season by the amount

required for the Khairpur State channels, if placed upon the perennial basis. He explained the view of the INDEPENDENT MEMBERS that the internal distribution at Sukkur was a domestic affair, between British Sind and Khairpur State. With this the Committee agreed.

11. It may be added that before the proceedings concluded, Mr. Trench and Mr. Sladen submitted a statement to the Committee accepted by both parties, which would form the basis of the mean monthly draw-offs to be permitted to Khairpur State month by month. This statement will be found annexed to this report as Table I.

*Proposal II.—*

12. The Committee divided consideration of this proposal into two parts.

(a) *Rabi.*

The Committee find from the record placed at their disposal, that it was only in exceptional years that the total withdrawals of all projects on the Indus, *viz.* Sukkur project, Khairpur State, Thal project and the Paharpur extension, exceed the supplies available. Any deficiency of supply would be so small, that it would not cause any difficulty. On the Indus the Thal project would share any possible shortage with the Sukkur barrage canals on the basis of the authorized capacity for rabi on those canals. This would occur on rare occasions, for a few days only.

13. (b) *Kharif.*

The Committee found that the total additional demands, in excess of present withdrawals, amounted to between 11,000 and 12,000 cusecs. From this excess must be deducted the amounts used at present in the inundation canals on the Chenab. See Table II annexed to this report.

14. The amounts shown in this table would be of importance during September, to the inundation canals in Sind, in so far as they affect the level of the river water rather than the actual supplies.

For the inundation canals in lower Sind, an additional credit should be given for any reduction in the kharif discharge withdrawn by the Khairpur canal, consequent upon the conversion to perennial.

15. The Government of Bombay had already agreed to the Haveli project with a total kharif capacity of 7,500 cusecs. The total additional demands above that figure, now required for all projects contemplated including revisions, amount to approximately 3,900 cusecs. From this should be deducted the actual withdrawals of those inundation canals, which would be replaced by the Haveli project and have a capacity of 9,636 cusecs.

16. The above calculations assume that the projected canals together with the Panjnad canal will run full maximum authorized capacity throughout the entire kharif season. In practice, this does not occur on any canal, so that the above are the most adverse conditions that can possibly result.

Furthermore, a withdrawal in the upper reaches of the river is not completely reproduced in the lower reaches. This fact also has been neglected.

17. The Committee further recommends that apart from any other changes, the total maximum withdrawals at Sukkur should be increased by 6,500 cusecs in the month of October, to meet the deficit caused by the failure to include the requirements for kharif crops in that month on the Eastern Nara, the North Western and Dadu Canals.

*Proposal III.—*

18. Although the agreement reached between the INTERESTED PARTIES, treated POINTS III, IV and part of V together, the decisions reached are recorded in this report, separately, for the sake of clarity.

Therefore, the first point for consideration is the Clause 4. D. 2 of the Agreement between Punjab, Bahawalpur and Bikaner dated 4th. September 1920.

In this connection, the Committee unanimously recommends that the restrictions laid upon the Bahawalpur canals drawing supplies from the Chenab, by that clause, shall be removed.

19. Subject to this, and also subject to the acceptance by the Government concerned with supplies from the Gharra reach, of the remaining recommendations *in toto*, the Committee unanimously recommends the adoption of the perennial and maximum head capacities below :—

Canal.	Perennial (Rabi) Capacity.	Non-perennial Capacity.	Total (Kharif) Capacity.
Haveli .. .. .. ..	2,750	5,000	7,750
Panjnad .. .. .. ..	1,500	6,500	8,000
Totals ..	4,250	11,500	15,750

20. At this point Mr. Nicholson (Punjab) raised the question of defining the non-perennial share capacity for the Panjnad Canal, on the grounds that it was a transfer from the Sutlej Valley Project canals.

Sir Bernard Darley (Bahawalpur) objected, and held that if such capacity were defined for the Panjnad, it should be defined similarly for the Haveli.

The discussion is recorded<sup>4</sup> in the minutes of the meetings of the Committee and the two gentlemen finally agreed to accept the recommendation of the INDEPENDENT MEMBERS on this minor point.

21. The INDEPENDENT MEMBERS have given this point their careful consideration and find themselves unable to agree with Mr. Nicholson.

They recommend that the non-perennial share capacity should *not* be defined in the final agreement which must be entered into between the Parties. Their reasons are as under.

(a) The waters of the Gharra reach are to be reserved for the Canals off-taking therefrom.

The restriction on the withdrawal at Panjnad in relation to Sutlej supplies in this reach, is to be removed. This is the only connection between the Panjnad canal and canals taking off the Gharra reach. The final separation of the Panjnad from other Sutlej Valley Project canals removes any necessity there might have been to treat all these canals on similar lines.

(b) In practice, the INDEPENDENT MEMBERS fail to see any advantage in defining the non-perennial share capacity for the Panjnad Canal.

However cogent the reasons for defining non-perennial share capacity for the Sutlej Valley Project canals originally were, these reasons cannot apply to either Haveli or the Panjnad canals on the Chenab.

For the above reasons they advise against the adoption of Mr. Nicholson's suggestion.

22. Certain difficulties were discovered in defining the method of distribution. Additional information in connection with discharges at the two sites and in particular regarding regeneration, was not available immediately. Mr. Nicholson kindly agreed to arrange for the supply of the necessary hydrographs. Furthermore, both Sir Bernard Darley and Mr. Nicholson agreed to accept the recommendation of the INDEPENDENT MEMBERS on this minor point.

#### *Proposal IV.—*

23. As mentioned in paragraphs 18 and 19, the agreement reached in this connection is bound up with that in POINT III and part of V and acceptance is required of these POINTS together.

Dealing first with the perennial canals, the Committee unanimously recommends a re-distribution of capacities on the Gharra reach as under :—

Perennial.						Capacity.	Per cent. (rounded).
Punjab	..	..	..	..	..	3,940	30%
Bahawalpur	..	..	..	..	..	6,340	49%
Bikaner	..	..	..	..	..	2,720	21%

24. The Committee further recommends unanimously a distribution of kharif, non-perennial and total capacities as under :—

Sutlej Gharra Reach.

Partner.	Perennial Capacity.		Non-Perennial Share Capacity.		Total.		Non- Perennial Additional Capacity.	Total Maximum Capacity.
	Cusecs.	Per cent. rounded.	Cusecs.	Per cent. rounded.	Cusecs.	Per cent. rounded.	Cusecs.	Cusecs.
Punjab ..	3,940	30%	11,523	72%	15,463	53%	5,761	21,224
Bahawalpur ..	6,340	49%	4,467	28%	10,807	37%	2,233	13,040
Bikaner ..	2,720	21%	Nil.	..	2,720	10%	..	2,720
Total ..	13,000	..	15,990	..	28,990	..	7,994	36,984

#### Proposal V.—

25. The Committee find that the proposal to alter the dates of opening and closing of the non-perennial channels disclosed varying requirements. The recommendations recorded below, however, are the result of agreement and the Committee recommends their adoption *in toto*.

Proceeding up the rivers as hitherto.

(a) On the Indus, below Mithankot : Sind will retain the existing practice, as laid down in the Sukkur Project Report of 1919.

26. In the following paragraphs, the recommendations now recorded, vary in certain respects from the figures generally accepted at the Delhi meetings of the Committee 1st.—8th. March 1935.

The modifications now introduced, affect only the partners Punjab, Bahawalpur and Bikaner and have been formally accepted by their representatives at a subsequent meeting in Lahore dated the 28th. March, 1935. The INDEPENDENT MEMBERS therefore do not feel called upon to comment thereon, in any way and recommend their acceptance *in toto*.

27. (b) On the Indus above Mithankot and on the Panjnad and Haveli canals, the Kharif season shall be from 15th. April till 15th. October, but should water be available after the demands of the perennial canals have been met, the non-perennial canals may remain open till the 31st. of October.

*Provided that :* (i) if supplies are surplus at Sukkur a non-perennial canal may open after 1st. April.

(ii) Should supplies from the Western rivers be "switched" to the Sutlej, at some future date, no claim on such "switched" supplies shall be made on behalf of the non-perennial canals taking off at Trimmu (Haveli) and Panjnad.

(c) On the Sutlej Gharra reach for the Sutlej Valley canals.

In early Kharif the perennial canals of the 3 partners shall have preference to the extent of 26% of their revised capacities, i.e. :—

						26%
Punjab	..	..	..	..	3,940	1,024
Bahawalpur	..	..	..	..	6,340	1,648
Bikaner	..	..	..	..	2,720	707
					13,000	3,379

Until the river rises to give this discharge, 3,379 at canal heads, the rabi percentages shall apply. When the discharge available is above this, the excess shall be allotted to non-perennial canals in the following proportion :—

Punjab	..	..	..	..	..	72%
Bahawalpur	..	..	..	..	..	28%

until the non-perennial canals draw 26% of 15,990, i.e. 4,157.

Above this combined discharge  $3,379 + 4,157 = 7,536$  at canal heads the partners will share as follows :—

Punjab	..	..	..	..	..	53%
Bahawalpur	..	..	..	..	..	37%
Bikaner	..	..	..	..	..	10%

and these kharif percentages will apply, whatever the discharge, from July to 15th. October.

Bikaner Canal discharge will be gauged immediately downstream of the unlined portion, mile 6 approximately.

#### Summary.

28. Summarizing the above in the form of replies to the terms of reference, the Committee is unanimously of the opinion that :—

I. Additional supplies of water are required for :—

- (a) Khairpur State on the scale laid down in detail in paragraphs 7 to 11 above.
- (b) Bahawalpur State on the scale laid down in paragraph 19 above.
- (c) Haveli Project on the scale laid down in paragraph 19 above.

II. Such supplies are generally available in the river Indus and its tributaries. They can be distributed without detriment to the rights, existing or prospective, of the Interested Parties, provided that each Party makes mutual concessions detailed in the analysis in paragraphs 10, 12 to 17, 23 to 25, and 27 above.

29. The Committee emphasizes that this INTERIM REPORT deals only with matters of immediate importance to the INTERESTED PARTIES.

There are a number of additional points—important, though not urgent—arising from the enquiry to which the Committee proposes to invite the attention of the Government of India in the final REPORT.

We have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient servants,

F. ANDERSON,

Chairman.

F. A. BETTERTON,

Independent Member,

Committee on Distribution of Waters of Indus.

TABLE I

Statement showing monthly mean allotments for Khairpur Feeders.

MONTH.											MONTHLY MEAN, CUSECS.
April	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,000
May	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2,250
June	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3,000
July	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4,000
August	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4,000
September	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4,000
October	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2,675
November	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2,675
December	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2,625
January	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2,000
February	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2,000
March	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2,000

The rabi mean supply, based on Rohri canal rabi capacity factor, for Khairpur Feeders should be 2,429. Against this the State asks for 2,329 cusecs.

W. L. C. TRENCH.

J. M. SLADEN.

8th March, 1935.

TABLE II.

Total withdrawals of the Chenab Inundation and Sidhnai Canals to be absorbed in the Haveli Project.

Month.	1922-23.	1923-24.	1924-25.	1925-26.	1926-27.	1927-28.	1928-29.	1929-30.	1930-31.	1931-32.	1932-33.	1933-34.	1934-35.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
April	1-15	80	1,652	1,203	134	887	177	413	75	1,151	644	101	1,592	128
	16-30	613	2,047	1,172	120	438	151	3,661	907	3,212	318	170	1,130	161
	Mean	317	1,850	1,188	127	663	164	2,037	491	2,181	481	135	1,361	145
May	..	1,626	4,106	1,116	628	3,115	647	5,956	1,331	5,450	2,411	126	2,354	136
June	..	4,691	1,439	2,442	3,850	4,867	2,155	6,966	4,826	6,499	3,487	2,238	7,456	2,487
July	..	6,194	6,106	7,108	7,457	6,229	5,819	7,340	5,914	6,768	6,616	4,763	8,171	6,845
August	..	6,126	6,050	6,101	5,421	6,627	6,765	7,333	6,275	5,558	5,944	7,303	7,913	6,497
September	..	4,230	3,237	4,158	2,872	4,791	2,766	4,925	4,462	3,356	3,891	2,612	5,185	3,077
October	1-15	2,163	1,200	2,286	1,466	2,180	1,030	1,035	1,802	1,339	2,096	915	2,844	756
	16-31	1,194	771	1,433	937	1,727	616	515	1,194	558	1,727	440	2,289	343
	Mean	1,679	987	1,860	1,202	1,954	823	775	1,498	948	1,911	678	2,566	549

H. W. NICHOLSON.

**PART VI.**

**APPENDICES.**

## APPENDIX I. (A).

*Note, dated the 10th. December 1920, by Sir Thomas Ward, Kt., C.I.E., M.V.O., Inspector General of Irrigation in India, on the urgency of the accurate gauging of the Indus river and its tributaries.*

1. The Government of India have recently had under their consideration two irrigation projects of the first magnitude, for the Sukkur Barrage and Canals in Sind, and for the Sutlej Valley Canals in the Punjab. As the former project will draw its supplies from the Indus and the latter from a tributary of the same river, it was necessary to examine the question of the effect of the withdrawals proposed in the Punjab upon the supplies available at Sukkur before the Government of India could recommend to the Secretary of State that both schemes should be taken in hand simultaneously.

2. *Prima facie*, it is logical to assume that the abstraction of water from the tributaries of the Indus must necessarily diminish the volume passing Sukkur, but it is quite possible that this diminution is to some extent compensated for by seepage back into the river, during the rabi season, of a portion of the enormous withdrawals made by the Punjab during the kharif. Unfortunately the data available are too meagre to permit of a definite conclusion being arrived at on the subject. Such records of discharges as exist have, however, been carefully examined and analysed, and, on the information before them, the Government of India are satisfied that the Sutlej Valley Project can be put in hand without prejudicing the supplies necessary to secure the area of irrigation contemplated on the Sukkur Canals.

3. More than this it is impossible to assert, and the question of the collection of reliable data for the disposal of the problem has become one of the first urgency. It will obviously be necessary, once construction commences on the Sukkur scheme for any future projects put forward by the Punjab to be very carefully examined in relation to the possible effects of further withdrawals from the tributaries of the Indus upon the rights to irrigation from the Sukkur Canals upon which the Government of Bombay are now entering. I have no hesitation in saying that the data for such an examination do not at present exist, and that, unless steps are immediately taken to collect and collate them, endless difficulty is likely to ensue. Almost all the controversies which have up to date taken place in India in respect of questions of water-rights have been directly attributable to the fact that adequate figures were not forthcoming and that consequently recourse had to be had to indirect deductions and presumptions; the only method of averting such controversies is to have at hand reliable information on the factors in the case.

4. The problem which has to be solved in this instance is the determination of the natural supplies in the Indus and of the diminution or increase which takes place in these supplies consequent on the withdrawal of water for irrigation in the Punjab and the seepage of a portion of such withdrawals back into the rivers. This can only be done by careful gauging of the streams concerned; and it is this gauging which I would urge should at once be taken in hand in a systematic and scientific manner.

5. A certain amount of gauging\* is at present undertaken both at the headworks of the various canals in the Punjab and at various intermediate discharge sites, but examination of the results has shown that the records are not systematically kept and are not reliable in all cases. What is required is that a list of gauging sites should be drawn up, and that continuous observations should be made at them over a protracted period. In the table accompanying I have listed the sites which, if adopted, appear to me likely to give the material required.

6. This list is less formidable than might appear at first sight since gaugings, in some cases continuous, in others periodical, are already made at 16 out of the 23 sites proposed. At such stations all that will be necessary will be to arrange for continuous gaugings being made and to ensure that as accurate results as possible are obtained from them.

7. In addition to the gauging of the rivers, accurate measurements of the withdrawals by all canals, both in British and Bahawalpur territory, will require to be made.

8. In my opinion the best results will be achieved by the Bombay and Punjab Governments each appointing a special executive officer to deal with the work. In the Punjab the officer selected would be directly responsible for the gaugings at the seven new stations proposed, and would receive those from the other stations from their respective Executive Engineers. He would have no responsibility as to the latter but would visit the gauging sites from time to time and, as an expert, make suggestions so as to ensure the utmost accuracy possible being attained. He would also check, by means of reliable current meter observations, the results obtained at such stations with the object of determining the co-efficient, if any, to be applied to them. It will be for the Government of Bombay to decide whether the Bombay officer should be in direct charge of the gauging parties at Mithankot, Sukkur and Kotri, the responsibility for which rests, at present, with the Indus River Commission.

\*This information would be considerably more useful if discharge diagrams were substituted for the rise and fall diagrams now published.

APPENDIX I. (A)—*contd.*

9. But the main work of these officers would be the tabulation, co-ordination and scrutiny of the results obtained. For this purpose they would be required to meet at frequent intervals, probably every month, to discuss results. I would further propose that they should be required to report to a Committee, which should meet every year, consisting of the Chief Engineer, Bombay, the Chief Engineer in Sind, the two Punjab Chief Engineers and the Inspector General of Irrigation as Chairman, with power to add to their numbers. This Committee would review the report of the two executive officers and this review, together with the report and tables and diagrams of the observations made, would be printed and submitted annually to the Government of India.

10. I have referred above only to the question of the distribution of water as between the Punjab and Sind, but the same investigation should give valuable results as to apportionment between the various projects in the former province and between Upper and Lower Sind in the latter. I do not propose, in this note, to deal with this aspect of the question nor need I refer to the valuable information likely to be obtained by a careful investigation of the subsoil conditions underlying the Punjab doabs. It will, however, be obvious that the Committee suggested above will be in a position to give material assistance to Government in respect of any case in which these points are under discussion.

11. There are two points to which I would specially invite attention. The first is the extreme importance of the work to all the parties concerned, to the Government of the Punjab because all future schemes in that province will have to be examined with an eye to the rights of Sind to irrigation, to the Government of Bombay because projects for extensions in Sind will similarly have to be analysed with reference to the prescriptive rights which would thereby be acquired by them as against the Punjab, to the possible prejudice of extensions in that province, and to the Government of India as arbiter in inter-provincial differences. This importance should be clearly kept in mind when officers are being appointed to the work, such officers being selected for their special abilities as men likely to take a keen and scientific interest in their duties, and should also be impressed upon all those Executive Engineers who will be responsible for individual gauging stations, upon the results obtained at which the special officers must largely depend for their data.

12. The second point is the desirability of continuous daily observations of discharges. From personal experience in Seistan and Siam I am convinced that in no other way can reliable results be obtained and no trouble is too great when compared with the advantages gained from complete continuity of observations. I would strongly advocate the observation of daily discharges (not merely gauge readings) at all the stations selected, current meter observations being made at the more important ones, frequent discharges should also be taken to check the volume of the withdrawals, the canal-head discharge curves being recalibrated where necessary. Only in this way will finality be reached.

13. I am aware that considerable trouble and expense will be involved by these suggestions but both trouble and money will have been expended to the best possible advantage if the fruitless discussions, which are otherwise bound to arise between Sind and the Punjab, are averted and the consequent delays in the development of irrigation obviated.

True Copy.

W. R. CHAMBERS,

*Superintendent, Government of India,*

*Public Works Department.*

## APPENDIX I. (B).

*List of sites referred to in paragraph 5 of Note, dated 10th. December 1920, by Sir T. R. J. Ward,  
Inspector General of Irrigation.*

Serial No.	River.	Site.	Officer responsible.		
1	Jhelum .. ..	Mangla .. .. ..	Executive Engineer, Mangla.		
2	Do. .. ..	Rasul .. .. ..	Do.	Rasul.	
3	Jhelum .. ..	Above junction with Chenab.	Special Executive Engineer.		
	Chenab .. ..	Above junction with Jhelum.			
	Chenab .. ..	Haveli.			
4	Chenab .. ..	Marala .. .. ..	Executive Engineer, Marala.		
5	Do. .. ..	Khanki .. .. ..	Do.	Khanki.	
6	Ravi .. ..	Madhopur .. .. ..	Do.	Madhopur	
7	Do. .. ..	Balloki .. .. ..	Do.	Balloki.	
8	Do. .. ..	Sidhnai .. .. ..	Do.	Sidhnai.	
9	Chonab .. ..	Sher Shah .. .. ..	Do.	Multan.	
10	Beas .. ..	Pang .. .. ..	Special Executive Engineer.		
11	Beas .. ..	Above junction with Sutlej.	Do.	do.	
	Sutlej .. ..	Gidar Pindi bridge.			
	Do. .. ..	Western Bein.			
	Do. .. ..	Eastern Bein.			
12	Do. .. ..	Bhakra .. .. ..	Executive Engineer, Rupar.		
13	Do. .. ..	Rupar .. .. ..	Do.	do.	
14	Do. .. ..	Gandasinghwala .. .. ..	Executive Engineer, Upper Sutlej.		
15	Do. .. ..	Salmanke .. .. ..	Special Executive Engineer.		
16	Do. .. ..	Jamlera .. .. ..	Do.	do.	
17	Do. .. ..	Adamwahan .. .. ..	Executive Engineer, Lower Sutlej.		
18	Chenab .. ..	Panjnad Weir* .. .. ..	Special Executive Engineer.		
19	Indus .. ..	Kalabagh .. .. ..	Do.	do.	
20	Do. .. ..	Ghazi Ghat (Dera Ghazi Khan) .. ..	Executive Engineer, Dera Ghazi Khan.		
21	Do. .. ..	Mithankot .. .. ..	Indus River Commission.		
22	Do. .. ..	Sukkur .. .. ..	Do.		
23	Do. .. ..	Kotri .. .. ..	Do.		

\*The conditions at this site are very exceptional, lying as it does immediately below the confluence of two large rivers, and it is very important that continuous detailed discharges should be made there by a competent observer as physical problems of considerable difficulty may be apprehended in the designing and siting of the proposed weir.

**APPENDIX II. (A).**  
**THE ORIGINAL ISSUES.**

1. Should the non-perennial irrigated areas receive perennial water ?
2. The representatives of the different parties will please give the required information in the form attached.\*

NOTE.—The representatives of the Interested Parties should be in a position to justify their project intensities as they will be examined on these.

(For definition of "intensity", please see item No. 39 of Central Board of Irrigation, Publication No. 5.)

3. *Duties*.—The representatives of the Interested Parties should be in a position to state their duties as these will be analysed in respect of quality of land, rainfall, method of cropping and sub-soil water-table.

(For definition of "duty", please see item No. 56 of Central Board of Irrigation, Publication No. 5.)

4. At this stage the members of the Committee will be called upon to express their views as to whether the available discharges should be divided on a basis of gross area or culturable irrigable area.

5. What are the available river supplies at all the strategic points on the Indus and its tributaries between October and June ?

Regeneration will be examined at this stage.

6. The available supplies in early kharif are generally inadequate for perennial and non-perennial canals. The Committee will therefore consider the advisability of fixing the percentage of withdrawals of each party for perennial and non-perennial canals or for both.

7. The Committee will discuss the question of inundation canals at this stage in respect of the minimum levels required.

8. With reference to the Haveli project, what are the maximum and mean supplies required in (a) kharif and (b) rabi, and are these supplies available without affecting the efficiency of the existing canal system ?

9. With reference to the Thal project what are the maximum and mean supplies required in (a) kharif and (b) rabi, and are these supplies available without affecting the efficiency of the existing canal systems ?

10. The Committee may be asked to express their view as to the advisability of an independent water control officer.

F. ANDERSON,  
*Chairman.*

---

\* Not printed.

## APPENDIX II. (B).

## THE FINAL FORM OF THE ISSUES.

1. *A principle*.—Should non-perennial irrigated areas receive perennial water?

2. *Project areas*.—The representatives of the Interested Parties will please give the required information in the form attached.\*

NOTE.—The representatives of the Interested Parties should be in a position to justify their project intensities as they will be examined on these.

(For definition of "intensity" please see item No. 39 of Central Board of Irrigation, Publication No. 5.)

3. *Duties*.—The representatives of the Interested Parties should be in a position to state their duties as these will be analysed in respect of quality of land, rainfall, method of cropping and sub-soil water-table.

(For definition of "duty", please see item No. 56 of Central Board of Irrigation, Publication No. 5.)

4. *A principle*.—At this stage the members of the Committee will be called upon to express their views as to whether the available discharges should be divided on a basis of gross area or culturable irrigable area.

5. *Records*.—What are the available river supplies at all the strategic points on the Indus and its tributaries between September and June?

The Committee will also discuss the question of inundation canals in respect of the minimum levels required.

Regeneration also will be examined at this stage.

6. *A principle*.—Should existing canals take precedence over future projects in considering the division of surplus water found available?

7. *Records*.—The available river supplies for certain existing canals, both perennial and non-perennial, are said to be inadequate at certain seasons. The Committee will examine this question together with that of the dates of opening and closing of non-perennial channels.

8. With reference to the Haveli project, what are maximum and mean supplies required in (a) kharif and (b) rabi, and are these supplies available without affecting the efficiency of the existing canal systems?

9. With reference to the Thal project, what are the maximum and mean supplies required in (a) kharif and (b) rabi, and are these supplies available without affecting the efficiency of the existing canal systems?

10. *Control*.—The Committee may be asked to express their view as to the advisability of an independent "water control officer".

—F. ANDERSON,

*Chairman.*

---

\* Not printed.

## APPENDIX III.

*Circular dated 5th. March 1935 from Independent Members to Interested Parties presenting POINTS FOR DISCUSSION.*

The Independent Members of the Committee on the Distribution of the waters of the Indus and its Tributaries offer the following suggestions as its bases for discussion by the representatives of the Interested Parties.

From the hydrographs and other records examined they are of opinion that the water supplies at the critical points are sufficient to justify them in putting forward the suggestions below as a reasonable basis for solution of the problem.

In doing so the Independent Members have confined themselves strictly to principle leaving details to be worked out after the other Members have recorded their views on them

I. *Khairpur*.—The allotment of water for the irrigation of Khairpur State to be on precisely the same footing as that of British Sind, having due regard to the principles which exclude areas from irrigation due to high water-table or similar causes.

II. *Sind*.—Sind to share the waters of the Indus with the Thal Project when constructed.

(a) In this connection the Independent Members are of opinion that the water supplies already guaranteed to Sind are unduly high, and will urge the necessity on several grounds of restricting water supplies to the minimum required for efficient irrigation. Nevertheless it is not proposed to reduce the project intensity or the maximum authorized discharges.

(b) The change in the authorized share of Khairpur will result in a reduction of the water allotted to it in kharif together with an allotment of rabi water. The amount of the allotment of rabi water will be added to the total authorized withdrawal at Sukkur.

(c) Thal and Sukkur will share shortage in proportion to the head capacity or authorized full supply discharge.

III. *Bahawalpur at Panjnad*.—The Independent Members are fully alive to the reasons which led to the restrictions on the withdrawals from the Chenab of the Bahawalpur canals at Panjnad. The settlement proposed in its entirety will remove the necessity for these restrictions. It is proposed, therefore, that the Bahawalpur canals at Panjnad and the Haveli project should share the available water strictly on a basis of their capacities or authorized full supply discharges. Hereafter the Bahawalpur canals at Panjnad will have no *claim* whatsoever on Sutlej water. Nevertheless, should surplus water pass below Islam, during a period when Haveli and Panjnad are below indent, then such supply will be taken into account when calculating relative shares of Haveli and Panjnad.

IV. *Bahawalpur on the Gharra reach*.—It appears clear that the supplies available to Bahawalpur on the basis of the existing agreement are unduly large and it is proposed to reallocate the waters available in the Gharra reach. The new capacities might be fixed on a basis of the areas, as accepted during the meetings of this Committee.

V. *Kharif Period*.—It appears to be the general view of the Committee that the kharif period in the West Punjab and Sind is approximately fifteen days later than in the rest of the Punjab. It is proposed that for all purposes the kharif period should be fixed from the 1st. of April to the 31st. of October, and that changes in authorized shares should take place on these dates.

F. ANDERSON.

F. A. BETTERTON.

## APPENDIX IV.

*Statement showing discharges of Panjnad River during early and late kharif period during the past 4 years.*

[To be substituted for Annexure G appended to the Bahawalpur BRIEF.]

Period.	1931.	1932.	1933.	1934.
April 1—10	.. .. .. ..	16,208	12,551	15,084
„ 11—20	.. .. .. ..	22,976	14,393	19,422
„ 21—30	.. .. .. ..	31,460	19,156	25,541
May 1—10	.. .. .. ..	34,097	19,075	25,398
„ 11—20	.. .. .. ..	44,552	18,702	37,377
„ 21—31	.. .. .. ..	41,863	21,727	40,476
June 1—10	.. .. .. ..	41,498	35,067	59,430
Sept. 21—30	.. .. .. ..	51,665	23,448	109,440
Oct. 1—10	.. .. .. ..	24,701	12,758	61,651
„ 11—20	.. .. .. ..	17,329	5,770	20,429
„ 21—31	.. .. .. ..	12,969	3,890	10,022

J. P. GUNN.

## APPENDIX V.

**DEFINITIONS** in respect to areas employed by the Interested Parties in their Briefs indicating the basis of allocation of water.

## A.—SIND.

*Gross Irrigable Area.*—The gross area less such area within the irrigation limit as may be excluded from irrigation by the project system or channel for any such reasons as high spring level or unsuitability of soil for canal irrigation.

*Culturable Irrigable Area.*—The gross area irrigable by lift or flow less the area not available for cultivation e.g. village areas, roads, unculturable lands.

**NOTE**—Large areas of unirrigable lands are excluded from the gross irrigable area. Small isolated patches are excluded under the heading culturable irrigable area as unculturable lands.

W. L. C. TRENCH.

## B.—PUNJAB.

## SUTLEJ VALLEY PROJECT.

*Gross Commanded Area.*—In the case of the Sutlej Valley Project this is the total area within the irrigation limits. For the canals as constructed the limit of irrigation along the river is however somewhat different to that on which the areas were determined for the purposes of the 1920 Agreement.

*Culturable Commanded Area.*—In the case of this project the culturable area commanded has been determined from actual rectangulation and level surveys. Any area which is irrigated by lift, although not commanded by flow, is included as culturable commanded area.

## COLONY CANALS.

*Gross Commanded Area.*—In the case of the colony canals the gross commanded area shown in the published statistics is the summation of the areas of all the villages and colony in chaks in which irrigation takes place. There are a certain number of other villages and chaks of crown waste in which no irrigation has so far taken place. These areas are not included. The total of such areas is not however so great as to materially affect the total area.

*Culturable Commanded Area.*—The culturable commanded area on the colony canals however is the total allotted area in which irrigation has taken place. Culturable commanded area which has not been so far allotted is not included under this head. As in the case of the Sutlej Valley Project, land actually uncommanded by flow but which is irrigated by lift is included in the culturable commanded area. It is on the culturable commanded area as recorded above that the water allowance for irrigation purposes is determined. In some cases of old villages on the Lower Chenab Canal an arbitrary culturable commanded area has been shown which has no connection with the actual, due to the fact that the supplies previously granted were not fully utilized.

## SIRHIND CANAL.

*Gross Commanded Area.*—In the case of Sirhind Canal it is the summation of the areas of villages in which irrigation takes place. The villagers concentrate their irrigation in a portion of the village as the effect of irrigation on the land renders it less suitable for barani crops.

*Culturable Commanded Area.*—The culturable commanded area on the Sirhind Canal is the summation of the areas of the fields in each village which actually come under irrigation. This concentration of irrigation in a portion of the village leads to greater efficiency as the watercourses are shorter and do not extend over the whole village. The result however is that considerable areas which are culturable and potentially commanded are not included.

H. W. NICHOLSON.

## C.—BAHAWALPUR.

*Gross Commanded Area.*—That portion of the gross irrigable area which is commanded by flow irrigation.

*Culturable Commanded Area.*—That portion of the culturable irrigable area which is commanded by flow irrigation.

B. DARLEY.

## D.—BIKANER.

*Gross Area.*—On the Bikaner Canal the gross area includes all land within the irrigation boundaries of distributaries. Large blocks of land between distributary irrigation boundaries to which it is not proposed to give irrigation at present are not included in the gross area.

*Culturable Commanded Area.*—The culturable commanded area is the gross area within irrigation boundaries of distributaries less all land not easily commanded by flow, less unculturable land excluded by reason of the fact that it is occupied by village sites, roads, railways, canals and sandhills.

T. A. W FOY.



## SUBJECT INDEX.

Subject.	Volume I.		Volume II.		Volume III.	
	Page.	Para.	Page.	Para.	Proceedings.	
					First meeting.	Second meeting.
Absorption in Canals .. ..	...	..	68	40	159 273—277 384 397—398	
„ in Rivers, and Regeneration.	19	27—28	..	..	451—452 551—558 661 667—668	
Adjustment of Costs .. ..	28	5	..	..	..	..
Agreements .. ..	28	6	..	..	..	1115—1116 1154
Allocation of water, Basis of ..	24	42	103	App. V.	578—583 Appendix	VIII 1118
Allowances, Water .. ..	16	9	..	..	74 227 326—327 337 664	..
Areas, Non-perennial .. ..	24	46	..	..	41—48 53—56 84—85 87	..
„ of Projects .. ..	..	..	..	..	..	Appendices IV & VIII.
Bahawalpur, Claims of .. ..	18	22—24	15 17 41 et seqq.	15 21—22	713—718	..
Basis of Allocation of water ..	24	42	103	App. V.	578—583 Appendix	VIII 1118
Bikaner, Claims of .. ..	(15)	(2)	16 18 59 et seqq.	(16 26)	695—696	..
Canal, Gang .. ..	12 22 22	(28 31 33—37)	..	..	930—931 934 940	..
„ Haveli .. ..	8 12 19	6—7 29 25—30	34 47 91	1—11 45—56 19—21	659—674 682—687 932—933 942—948	1017—1035 1041—1044 1073—1090 1133—1135 1139—1142 1156—1161
„ Khairpur .. ..	12 15	26 4—13	17 81	20 7—11	361—377 895—913 980—982	1129—1130 1156
„ Paharpur .. ..	13 18 18	30 16—17 19—20	.. ..	.. ..	232—240 562—565 767—768	1009—1010 1012—1015 1036—1040 1156
„ Panjnad .. ..	12 19	27 25—30	17 42 48 91	22 15—20 57—58 19—21	491—495 675—681 932—933 942—948	1017—1035 1041—1071 1073—1090 1133—1135 1139—1142 1156—1161

Subject.	Volume I.		Volume II.		Volume III.	
	Page.	Para.	Page.	Para.	Proceedings.	
					First meeting.	Second meeting.
Canal, Sukkur .. ..	9 12 15 16 22 27	10 25 4-5 7-21 34 4	2 3 3 3 5 10 27	3 7 9 12 20 3 3-6	467-473 921-923	1012-1015 1036-1040 1156
.. Thal .. ..	8 8 12 18 18	4 6-13 29 17-18 20	2 4 6 36 49	5-6 16-17 21-26 12-14 61-62	223-228 744-753	1007-1008 1012-1015 1036-1040 1044-1071 1137 1130-1142 1156 1161
Canals, Absorption in .. ..	..	..	68	40	159 273-277 384 397-398	..
.. Inundation .. ..	27	2	13 28 46	8-11 10-11 42-43	278-279 292-294 298-300 442-449 457-467 479-490 619-629 636 643 645	..
.. Non-perennial .. ..	24	26	92	27	652-657	..
Capacity Factor .. ..	20 21	30 Table IV	67	36-37	45	1138
Claims of Bahawalpur .. ..	18	22-24	15 17 41 et seqq.	15 21-22	713-718	
.. Bikaner .. ..	15	2	16 18 59 et seqq.	16 26	695-696	..
.. Khairpur .. ..	15	4-6	14 16 27 81 et seqq. 89	12 19-20 5-6 7-11	475-476 631-635	989-1006
.. North-West Frontier Province .. ..	18	16	15 18	14 25	..	..
.. Punjab .. ..	15 17 18	2 14-16 22-24	15 16 33 et seqq.	13 18	697-711 720-721	..
.. Sind .. ..	16	7-8	14 18 27 et seqq.	12 24	976-979	..
Committee, Indus Discharge .. ..	11 18	20-21 23	11	4-7	..	..
Control .. ..	19 25 28	27-29 51-52 7	..	..	799-835	1164-1167

Subject.	Volume I.		Volume II.		Volume III.	
	Page.	Para.	Page.	Para.	Proceedings.	
					First meeting.	Second meeting.
Costs, Adjustment of ..	28	5	..	..	..	..
Discharge, Indus Committee ..	11 18	20—21 23	11	4—7	..	..
"    Measurements ..	27	1	3 9 96	12—13 38—39	424—436	..
App. I (A) & I. (B).						
Duties, intensities, etc. ..	9	8	3 5 9 68 68	10 19—20 40 38—39 41—47	74 133—136 235 242—253 268—279 285—287 295—297 302—305 326—327 336—337 361—363 365 383 386—389 512—513 666	..
Existing Schemes, Priority of, over new Projects.	23	38—41	..	..	16—19 35—38 584—598	
Factor, Capacity ..	20 21	30 Table IV	67	36—37	45	1138
Gang Canal ..	12 22 22	(28) 31 33—37	.. .. ..	..	930—931 934 940	..
Haveli Canal ..	8 12 19	6—7 29 25—30	34 47 91	1—11 45—56 19—21	659—674 682—687 932—933 942—948	1017—1035 1041—1044 1073—1090 1133—1135 1139—1142 1156—1161
Indus Discharge Committee ..	11 18	20—21 23	11	4—7	..	..
Inundation Canals ..	27	2	13 28 46	8—11 10—11 42—43	278—279 292—294 298—300 442—449 457—467 479—490 619—629 636 643 645 652—657	
Intensities, duties, etc. ..	9	8	3 5 9 68 68	10 19—20 40 38—39 41—47	74 133—136 235 242—253 268—279 285—287 295—297 302—305 326—327 336—337 361—363 365 383 386—389 512—513 666	

Subject.	Volume I.		Volume II.		Volume III.	
	Page.	Para.	Page.	Para.	First meeting.	Second meeting.
Khairpur Canals .. ..	12 15	26 4—13	17 81	20 7—11	361—377 895—913 980—982	1129—11c 115
"    Claims .. ..	15	4—6	14 16 27 81 et seqq. 89	12 19—20 5—6 7—11	475—476 631—635	980
Kharif Period .. ..	19 22	25—26 32—37	65 92	30—33 25—27	602—618 639—646 953—954	1144—11a
Measurements, Discharge .. ..	27	1	3 9 96	12—13 38—39	424—436	..
Non-Perennial Areas .. ..	24	46	..	App. I (A) and I (B).	41—48 53—56 84—85 87	..
"    Canals .. ..	24	46	92	27	..	..
North-West Frontier Province, Claims of .. ..	18	16	15 18	14 25	..	..
Paharpur Canal .. ..	13 18 18	30 16—17 19—20	..	..	232—240 562—565 767—768	1009—1010 1012—1015 1036—1040 1156
Punjab Canals .. ..	12 19	27 25—30	17 42 48 91	22 15—20 57—58 19—21	491—495 675—681 932—933 942—948	1017—1035 1041—1071 1073—1090 1133—1135 1139—1142 1156—1161
Period, Kharif .. ..	19 22	25—26 32—37	65 92	30—33 25—27	602—618 639—646 953—954	1144—1147
Permission to use water where desired	24	46—47	..	..	159—161 173—178 957—960	1121—1122 1145 1148—1149 1162
Priority of existing schemes over new projects.	23	38—41	..	..	16—19 35—38 584—598	..
Project, Sutlej Valley .. ..	8 10 11 22	4—5 14—15 24 34—37	3 3 3 7 91 92	7 9 12 27 23—24 27	930—931 934—941	1091—1113 1144—1147
Woolar Lake .. ..	25 25	48 50	36	16—19	849—850	1153
Projects, Areas of .. ..	..	..	..	..	Appendices IV and VIII.	
Priority of new over existing	23	38—41	..	..	16—19 35—38 584—598	
Punjab, Claims of .. ..	15 17 18	2 14—16 22—24	15 16 33 et seqq.	13 18	607—711 720—721	

Subject.	Volume I.		Volume II.		Volume III.	
	Page.	Para.	Page.	Para.	Proceedings.	
					First meeting.	Second meeting.
Rainfall .. .. ..	..	..	68	38—39	254—261 281—284 338 385 396	..
Regeneration and absorption in Rivers	19	27—28	..	..	451—452 551—558 661 667—668	..
Rivers, Regeneration and absorption in	19	27—28	..	..	451—452 551—558 661 667—668	..
" Supplies available in ..	8 15 19 22	3 3 24—25 31	3 43 45 66 90	11 22—24 32—41 34—37 12—17	424—441 512—513 528—549 562—565 602—629 914—922	..
Sind, Claims of .. .. ..	16	7—8	14 18 27 et seqq.	12 24	976—979	
Soil Surveys .. .. ..	24	42	..	..	290	1118
Storage, including switching ..	25 25	48—50 53—56	36	16—22	639—641 725—742 849—869 884—887	1152—1153 1172—1183
Sukkur Canals .. .. ..	9 12 15 16 22 27	10 25 4—5 7—21 34 4	2 3 3 3 5 10 27	3 7 9 12 20 3 3—6	467—473 921—923	1012—1015 1036—1040 1156
Supplies available in rivers ..	8 15 19 22	3 3 24—25 31	3 43 45 66 90	11 22—24 32—41 34—37 12—17	424—441 512—513 528—549 562—565 602—629 914—922	..
Surveys, Soil .. .. ..	24	42	..	..	290	1118
Sutlej Valley Project .. .. ..	8 10 11 22	4—5 14—15 24 34—37	3 3 3 7 91 92	7 9 12 27 23—24 27	930—931 934—941	1091—1113 1144—1147
Switching, including storage ..	25 25	48—50 53—56	36	16—22	639—641 725—742 849—869 884—887	1152—1153 1172—1183
Thal Canal .. .. ..	8 8 12 18 18	4 6—13 29 17—18 20	2 4 6 36 49	5—6 16—17 21—26 12—14 61—62	223—228 744—753	1007—1008 1012—1015 1036—1040 1044—1071 1137 1139—1142 1156 1161
Utilization of water where desired ..	24	46—47	..	..	159—161 173—178 957—960	1121—1122 1145 1148—1149 1162

Subject.	Volume I.		Volume II.		Volume III.	
	Page.	Para.	Page.	Para.	Proceedings.	
					First meeting.	Second meeting.
Water allowances.. ..	16	9	..	..	74 227 326—327 337 664	..
Water, Basis of allocation of ..	24	42	103	App. V.	578—583 Appendix VIII.	1118
" Permission to utilize where desired	24	46—47	..	..	159—161 173—178 957—960	1121—1122 1145 1148—1149 1162
Waterlogging .. .. ..	24 27	43—45 3	81	9	73—76 84—85 112—119 368 372	1118—1120 1124 1163
Water-table .. .. ..	24	43—45	..	..	42—43 45—46 56 62—63 87—88 144 153—154 290—291 338 372	1118
Veer Lake Project .. ..	25 25	48 50	36	16—19	849—850	1153

